The Communist

20c. SEPTEMBER 1941

THE WORKING CLASS AND THE NATIONAL FRONT AGAINST HITLER

AN EDITORIAL ARTICLE

•

MUNICH AND ANTI-MUNICH

ROBERT MINOR

•

FOR THE MILITARY DESTRUCTION OF HITLERISM

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

•

THE NEGRO PEOPLE AND THE FIGHT FOR JOBS

THEODORE R. BASSETT

•

TWO QUESTIONS ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN UNDER CAPITALISM

A. LANDY

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RECENT BOOKS

LABOR FACT BOOK 5, prepared by Labor Research Association $1.00

Over 10,000 useful facts about labor, the war, social conditions, legislation, civil liberties and other subjects.

CONDITIONED REFLEXES AND PSYCHIATRY, by Ivan P. Pavlov $4.00

This new volume by the world's foremost authority in the sphere of conditioned reflexes makes available the results of thirty five years of study and research.

THE SOVIET POWER, by Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury . . . . . $ .35

A vivid and dramatic study of how socialism works on one-sixth of the world, by one of the world's leading Churchmen.

THE WAY OUT, by Earl Browder . . . . . $ .35

A guide to the special events which are reshaping the world today, by the General Secretary of the Communist Party.

WE ARE MANY, by Ella Reeve Bloor $2.25

"Mother" Bloor's autobiography is the story of five decades of struggle and achievement in the cause of labor and socialism.

WHY FARMERS ARE POOR, by Anna Rochester . . $1.25

A new low priced edition of the most authoritative and comprehensive study of agriculture in the United States today.

Order from:

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XX, No. 9 SEPTEMBER, 1941

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.
EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

CONTENTS

Editorials		755
The Working Class and the National Front Against Hitlerism		763
Munich and Anti-Munich	*Robert Minor*	776
For the Military Destruction of Hitlerism	*William Z. Foster*	793
With All Possible Clarity	*José Diaz*	801
The Negro People and the Fight for Jobs	*Theodore R. Bassett*	805
Two Questions on the Status of Women Under Capitalism	*A. Landy*	818
Book Reviews		834
Latest Books and Pamphlets Received		848

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Send checks, money orders and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 East 13th Street), New York. Subscription rate: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A. 201

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

READY IN SEPTEMBER:

JOSEPH STALIN

A SHORT BIOGRAPHY

This authoritative life story of Joseph Stalin, leader of the Soviet Union and of the Bolshevik Party, provides the best general account of the practical and theoretical contributions made by Stalin to the success of the October Revolution of 1917, and to the subsequent building of socialism on one-sixth of the world.

Starting with Stalin's childhood and youth, this biography traces his activities as a revolutionary in his native Georgia, his meeting and life-long collaboration with V. I. Lenin, his many arrests and years of exile at the hands of the tsarist police, his role during the February and October Revolutions, his brilliant military leadership during the civil war and the war of intervention. It describes Stalin's successful fight to carry through the Five-Year Plans, the collectivization and mechanization of agriculture, the building of a powerful Red Army and Navy. It deals also with Stalin's great contributions in the realm of Marxist-Leninist theory, particularly on the questions of the state, the victory of socialism in a single country, and on the national question.

The criminal assault of Hitler Germany against the Soviet Union, and Stalin's active leadership in the war against Hitlerism, lend added weight and interest to this biographical study.

PRICE 20 CENTS

●

Order from:

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDITORIALS

AMERICA'S ROLE IN CREATION OF A WESTERN FRONT

EVENTS since June 22 on the military and political fields have already proven the following: The glorious and magnificent struggles of the Red Army and Navy and Air Force have shattered beyond repair the myth of the so-called invincibility of Hitler's armed forces. Fascist Germany has been forced to begin to prepare for a long war. What has transpired on the Eastern front thus far has proven to be only the beginning.

Major George Fielding Eliot has done no more than express a very cautious (too cautious) attitude on the "unexpected quality of the Russian fighting," saying on July 29:

". . . if it has done no more for us than to explode the sickening myth of German invincibility, of the hopelessness of resistance to the mighty Wehrmacht, it has done much; our mental atmosphere will be the healthier and our spirits the stouter to face the trials that lie before us on the long road to victory." (*New York Herald Tribune.*)

These trials we must now face; we haven't yet faced them fully. The nation has to be united, more speedily and more solidly. All parties and all groups devoted to the national interests have to be brought together in an unbreakable national front against Hitlerite Germany. Thus will the United States be able to make its maximum contribution to the military defeat of German fascism; and, in the first place, to exercise its full influence and support *for the creation of a second front in the West.*

This war with fascist Germany, said Stalin, is not an ordinary war. "It is not only a war between two armies, it is also a great war of the entire Soviet people against the German fascist forces." And so it is being fought on the Eastern front. The entire Soviet people have risen against the enemy, fighting him on his front, in his rear, and on his flanks. This it is that makes possible the successful Soviet defense "in depth." This it is that underlies the Soviet military doctrine of combining active defense, counter-attack and eventual large-scale offense.

But to realize fully the great potentialities of this kind of a people's war against Hitler Germany, the American people—the United States—must support this war more actively, more energetically. The United States has to move more rapidly to closer collaboration with and participation in the great anti-Hitler coalition that is growing day

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by day. For this is the only way in which our country can make a fully adequate and effective contribution to the defeat of Hitlerite Germany, which is now threatening our national security not only from the Atlantic but—via Japan—also from the Pacific.

Whatever immediate steps have to be taken to meet the new moves of German-Japanese aggression, the *most* effective answer to these moves is for the United States to urge and support the opening of a land front in the West, and to take effective immediate measures against Hitler's ally in the Far East.

This growing coalition is the outstanding development on the political field since June 22. At the basis of this great and powerful coalition is the pact between the Soviet Union and Great Britain for joint action in the war against Hitler Germany. Joined in the coalition as active partners are the Czechoslovak republic, Poland and Yugoslavia, whose agreements with the Soviet Union are promoting the unification of the Slav peoples for liberation from fascist enslavement. The united front of the peoples against Hitler Germany is growing. The isolation of Hitler Germany is becoming more intense.

The American policy of aiding Great Britain, the Soviet Union and China in the struggle against the aggressors is of tremendous importance to the further development of the anti-Hitler coalition. The recent visit of Harry Hopkins to the Soviet Union has demonstrated, in the words of S. A. Lozovsky, head of the Soviet Information Bureau, "the United States' determination to aid all nations struggling for independence against fascist barbarism." This aid has to be greatly increased in every possible way. And the best way to insure the further extension of this aid, and the only way to bring the full weight of our country into the scales of victory against Hitler Germany, is for the United States to associate itself more intimately with the growing anti-Hitler coalition. The exchange of notes between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. on America's aid to the Soviet Union is a major step in that direction. There can be no doubt that such a course will receive the support of the overwhelming majority of the American people. Furthermore: a determined and conscientiously pursued policy at home, for the creation of a united national front against Hitler Germany, will quickly bring into being a united American nation, in active support for the opening of a land front in the West, for intimate and close participation in the world anti-Hitler coalition. The pursuit of such a national policy is bound to be successful, despite all the machinations and obstructions of our actual and potential Quislings—the Lindberghs, Wheelers, Norman Thomases and Hoovers.

It is already clear that the anti-Hitler coalition will progressively grow wider and stronger. But it will grow—is growing—*in actual struggle* against the *military* forces of German fascism. It will grow and is growing in the magnificent fight of the Red Army; in the developing active resistance to Hitler's armies by the peoples of the occupied and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enslaved countries, serious beginnings of which are already seen in Poland, Yugoslavia and Norway, and which are spreading to the other conquered countries of Western Europe and the Balkans; in the opening of a new land front in the West. This is how the anti-Hitler coalition will grow and fight its way to victory. All recent reports to this country on internal conditions in the enslaved countries of Europe are dominated by one fact: the successful resistance of the Soviet Union to Hitler's onslaught and the growing anti-Hitler coalition have instilled a new hope and confidence in the conquered nations, awakening them to action against the fascist conqueror, giving them a clear perspective for the victorious struggle for national liberation. And among the German people, the first signs of a coming awakening are already to be observed.

Facing these developments, can there be any doubt that the creation of a second front in the West is a vital and crucial need of the present situation? It is a need for which the greatest sacrifices are not too great. The creation of a second front in the West would achieve the following results: It would engage in active warfare simultaneously all of Hitler's armed forces, greatly weakening their ability to concentrate offensive power on either front and knocking the initiative for good out of Hitler's hands. It would accelerate tremendously and directly the further growth of mass people's warfare against the fascist armies in the conquered countries of Western Europe. It would constitute the most effective answer to the new Hitler military threats to the national security of the United States now coming from the Pacific via Japan.

Moved by some of these similar considerations, ever larger numbers of the British people are urging their government to open a new land front in the West. It is becoming the demand of the people. How soon the British Government will proceed to realize this demand, we cannot know. But it is evident that the United States is able to exercise great influence with the British Government in favor of opening a land front in the West. It is able to do so by greatly increasing and making more effective American aid to Britain and the Soviet Union, and *by demonstrating convincingly its readiness—the readiness of the United States—to do everything necessary to make possible and successful the creation of a second front in the West.* And this is clearly in the most vital interests of the national security of the United States. It is the policy of becoming associated more closely and intimately with the great anti-Hitler coalition.

The question might be asked: is there today sufficient national sentiment in the country to back up this policy, a policy inherent in the whole orientation of the American people and of the American Government? The answer is: there is already sufficient national support for such action; and a determined effort to rally all parties and groups in a *national front* for the military defeat of Hitler Germany,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subordinating everything to the need of achieving victory in this struggle, would meet with the enthusiastic response and ever-growing support of labor and the American people as such.

CONGRESS AND NATIONAL UNITY

IT IS a fact, which not even the Wheelers dare dispute, that the American people want Hitler Germany defeated. They do so because they abhor and detest fascism; because they feel that Hitler Germany is a menace to the national security and democratic liberties of our country. Whatever unclarity and differences still exist on the ways and means toward the objective—the defeat of Hitler—the objective itself has already become the main guide of our national policy. This is clearly the case among the masses of the people. But this is partly obscured by the fact that Congress, the legislative branch of the government, seems to represent a different picture. In Congress, especially in the Senate, there is a small but active and intensely vocal opposition to the national policy of helping to defeat Hitler; and in both houses there are considerable groups that are continually lending either passive or active support to this opposition. This situation in Congress not only obscures the considerable degree of national unity against Hitler Germany already existing in the country, but also seriously hampers the government in giving greater effectiveness to this national policy.

Consequently, a greater degree of national unity has to be brought about in Congress; at least as great a degree as already exists among the masses of the American people. Is it possible? The answer is: Yes. It is based on the proposition that the bulk of the Congressional dissenters from the national policy against Hitler Germany is motivated primarily not so much by real opposition to the national objective. These dissenters, some of them Democrats but most of them Republicans, are motivated largely by two considerations. First, partisan considerations. Since the present Administration is Democratic, the Republicans "naturally" have to be in opposition, and must keep in mind the coming Congressional elections and, perhaps, also the coming Presidential elections. This is justified in certain Republican quarters by what is designated as the partisanship of the Democrats and of the Administration. Second, anti-New Deal considerations. It is maintained in these same quarters that the Roosevelt Administration is exploiting the Hitler menace and the whole national defense in order to push forward the "collectivism" of the New Deal and to perpetuate the rule of the Democratic Party. Hence their dissension from and even opposition to the Administration's foreign policies as well as domestic.

Of course, this does not apply to the Wheelers, Hoovers and Lindberghs. It probably would not apply to the tendencies represented by Senator Vandenberg, either. But it

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

certainly does apply to a large number, if not the bulk, of the Republican delegation in Congress, beginning with those that generally agree with Willkie and including the political currents expressed by Representative Martin and Senator McNary. In other words, the present conduct of the Republican delegation in Congress on foreign affairs is being determined partly by considerations of domestic policy and political party relationships. But the Wheelers, Hoovers and Lindberghs are exploiting this situation (not without a certain success) to aggravate the divisions and to impart to Republican policy an anti-national coloration.

This being the case, there undoubtedly exists an objective basis for bringing about a greater degree of national unity in Congress. The basis exists for bringing the Republican Party delegation (its majority and bulk) into real and close partnership with the Democratic Party delegation and other national elements (Senator Norris, etc.), in a united national front to help and secure the military defeat of Hitler Germany. This would tend to isolate and effectively combat the influences of the Wheelers, Hoovers and Lindberghs, at the same time neutralizing the opposition of those small groups that might persist in standing "in-between" the national anti-Hitler front and the pro-fascist forces.

But, the question may be asked, how can we overcome all the serious differences of party division and on domestic policy? To which the fundamental answer is that the true national forces in the country are *already* being impelled to adopt such a mode of conduct as will *subordinate* all differences and divisions to the central task of helping to defeat Hitler Germany. This does not mean ignoring the differences or solving them in the selfish interests of one particular group to the detriment of the interests of the nation. It means finding such forms of solutions for arising practical differences as will contribute most effectively to the national struggle for the defeat of Hitler, as will tend to solidify the national front of the American people.

Seeing that the trend of affairs in the United States is toward a national front against Hitler Germany, the Wheelers are seeking to frighten political leaders (especially among the Republicans) with the threat of a new political party. Speaking in the Senate, on August 1, Senator Wheeer burst forth as follows:

"If the two parties continue to stand together on such programs as Union Now, the League of Nations and close connection with Great Britain, a new party will arise that will sweep the country."

Senator Wheeler knows, of course, that the Republican and Democratic Parties do not yet "stand together," either on the issues he mentions, or on any of the others. What he is trying to do with his "new party" threat is to obstruct and delay the coming together of all national forces into a united front against Hitler. It is to be hoped, however, that responsible political leaders in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the national forces of the country will not be affected by this empty bombast. They will realize, if they have not already done so, that the American people will judge parties and leaders, in forthcoming political contests, chiefly by one criterion: How well have they worked for the national front in this emergency? How freely and competently and self-sacrificingly have they contributed to the defense of America from the Hitler menace? How much have they done for the military defeat of Hitler Germany? And woe to him who will come to the masses of the people (not to be confused with the reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie which are cultivating the Wheelers, Hoovers, Lindberghs and Norman Thomases), in future elections, with a record of opposition to the national front against Hitler at a time when Hitler Germany was threatening the national and social security of the United States!

Nobody can now tell for sure the exact party alignments, or new parties, that may crystallize by the time the momentous struggle to defeat Hitler Germany is successfully concluded by the world anti-Hitler coalition. But it is sure that the political forces which will enjoy the confidence of the American people will be the national front forces, those that have done most and best for the destruction of Hitlerism and the liberation of the world from the fascist barbarians. The Wheelers, Lindberghs, Hoovers and Norman Thomases will be looked upon by the American people as enemies—enemies of the nation.

This is also the answer to the recent pro-Hitler sortie of a group of ex-leaders of the Republican Party. We refer to the statement issued from Alexandria Bay by fifteen persons headed by Hoover, Landon, Charles Dawes, etc., calling upon the Republican delegation in Congress to aggravate and perpetuate national disunity and to obstruct the government's policies to defend the United States. Because that is what it is. The majority of the Republican caucus in Congress hastened to give this statement some sort of endorsement, thus exposing the Republican Party to the charge of obstructing national defense. A most deadly charge when national defense has become really *national.*

The purpose of this statement from Alexandria Bay was clearly to prevent the crystallization of the national anti-Hitler front, which is already developing and which will bring into it, in one way or another, the bulk of the twenty-two million Republican voters, and all of its true national forces, in Congress and out. The Hoovers know it and fear it. And so does Hitler. Hence their Alexandria pronouncement. But a good deal has to be done yet to neutralize the purely partisan and narrowly political elements of the situation. And for this, we repeat, is needed a consistent and energetic policy *of a national anti-Hitler front,* isolating and defeating the Hoovers and Lindberghs and Wheelers.

The unfortunate part of this statement is the signature of John L. Lewis under it. But political facts are political facts and conclusions

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have to be drawn from them. By signing the Hoover statement Mr. Lewis has lent his name to a venture that carries great harm and danger to the American people. This means to the working class, which is the backbone of the people. Mr. Lewis has thus taken a step which associates him with spokesmen of the most reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie—the chief enemies of labor. And this is bad for labor, bad for the people, bad for John L. Lewis.

There are some who entertain the hope that it is possible for Mr. Lewis to lend support to Hoover and Lindbergh (which is objective support to Hitler) and still remain useful and helpful to labor in so-called "domestic" affairs. But that is an illusion. It was never possible to separate to the point of severance "foreign" policy from "domestic" policy. Now it is totally impossible. To defeat Hitler Germany is for the American people not "just" foreign policy. It is the main objective of *all policies*, and everything has to be subordinated to the real needs of this objective; these needs requiring scrupulous care for the material and spiritual well-being of the working people of this country. Consequently, the step taken by Mr. Lewis in association with the Hoovers in "foreign" policy must lead inevitably to similar reactionary steps in "domestic" policy, in all matters affecting the well-being of the working people.

Now that labor cannot have the guiding influence of John L. Lewis, for the building of its unity and for the national anti-Hitler front, labor will have to carry out this struggle without it and against it.

For it is clear that American labor has a great part to play in helping to realize the national anti-Hitler front. All organizations of labor—the C.I.O., the A. F. of L., the Railroad Brotherhoods; and all political currents and ideas that stand for the national objective of defeating Hitler Germany—all must unite for the common effort. Hence, the spokesmen and leaders of labor have no greater duty at the present time than to unite their actions for the national objective *and thus help bring about the national anti-Hitler front of the American people.*

Differences must take second place, and third and fourth. First place is taken by the national objective. By uniting itself for this objective, labor will influence the whole nation, thus making its best contribution to the national front. Certain individuals, wrongly believing or pretending to believe that they are serving national defense by carrying over from the recent past old differences and disagreements, advocate courses of action in the trade unions that obstruct the unification of labor and the unity of the nation. Such courses of action must be rejected. In some instances, divisive proposals are undoubtedly inspired by pro-fascist elements and fifth columnists. All such cases must be exposed and mercilessly combated. For everything must be done *to promote the cause of labor unity in the service of the national front against Hitler.*

Maintaining its political identity

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and independence, to make its maximum contribution to the national cause, the Communist Party will continue to do all to help realize labor's unity for the promotion of the national front against Hitler. It is with this end in view that we urge the adoption of the Murray Plan for Industrial National Defense Councils. And it is with the same end in view that we join with the tens and hundreds of thousands of Americans calling for the immediate and unconditional release of Earl Browder.

Yes, the Communist Party needs him. And so does the national front of the American people against Hitler. And for the same reason we stress before the Party membership and all friends: Form Browder Brigades to Double the Circulation of the *Daily Worker* and the *Sunday Worker*.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WORKING CLASS AND THE NATIONAL FRONT AGAINST HITLERISM

AN EDITORIAL ARTICLE

THE main immediate task of the American people is to weld the unity of all its forces, to gather all its resources, for an all-out struggle to assure the military defeat of Nazi Germany, the annihilation of Hitler and Hitlerism. All other tasks must be subordinated to this task. All other tasks must be part of and an aid to the *main task*. This is how the British people, the Chinese people and above all the people of the Soviet Union are waging their war against Nazi Germany. This is how the American people must conduct their struggle for the defeat of Hitlerism. *Everything*, every phase of our economic, political, social and cultural life must be organized with a view toward strengthening the struggle against Hitlerism. Everything and everyone that hinder this struggle must be combatted to the utmost.

Why must we do this? Because upon the outcome of the struggle against Nazi Germany and its allies rests, not only the future of the British people, the Soviet people, the Chinese people, all the peoples of Europe oppressed by Hitler, including the people of Italy and Germany, but no less the future of the American people. A victory of Hitler and his allies over Great Britain and the Soviet Union would be a victory also over the United States. It would mean the end of the freedom and independence of the American people. It would doom us and our children to the yoke of Nazi slavery. It would mean the destruction of all our liberties, our democratic institutions, our economic standards, our rights to fight for a better life and human dignity. And for this reason no task of the American people can stand above that of the struggle for the destruction of Hitlerism.

Hitler was able to conquer so many peoples and nations because the Lindberghs, Wheelers, Hoovers and Norman Thomases of those lands, representing the most reactionary, greedy and traitorous sections of monopoly capital, were able to divide the people, to strengthen Hitler through their appeasement policy, while many opponents of Hitlerism either minimized its danger or recognized it too late. The Quislings in our own land are no less menacing. They speak of a "negotiated peace" with Hitler. They mask their pro-Hitler policies under

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the guise of isolationism and pacifism. They minimize the menace of Hitlerism. They would divide the American people. Some, like Lindbergh, openly call for the victory of Hitler, betraying their own country in the name of "anti-Communism." Others, like the Hoovers and Landons, consider the struggle "between tyranny and freedom" an "illusion" that "the Anglo-Russian alliance has dissipated." This is how they spread the Hitler-poison among the American people, acting as agents of Goebbels' propaganda bureau.

But the overwhelming majority of the American people recognize the menace of Hitlerism to their freedom and independence, their liberties and welfare. They favor aid to Britain, China and the Soviet Union. They wish to see the defeat of Hitler and the victory of Great Britain, China and the Soviet Union. Despite all efforts of the reactionaries and their press, Americans in all walks of life and of all religious beliefs have declared in overwhelming numbers for the victory of the Soviet Union. They recognize that the great Soviet Union and the heroic Red Army are fighting to defend not only the Soviet Union, the great socialist state, but the freedom and independence of all peoples, that they are aiding the American people to defend and preserve their freedom and independence.

If the American people have not made greater progress in achieving national unity in the struggle against Hitlerism, this is due largely to the fact that while the pro-Hitler and appeasement forces have united their ranks and shown great initiative and activity in going to the masses, the anti-Hitler camp, including the labor movement, remains largely disunited and has not as yet displayed the necessary initiative and activity, has not developed the campaign of education and enlightenment among the masses that the situation demands. This is why the draft extension bill was carried in the House by a margin of only one vote. This is why we hear so much about the "lack of morale" among the selectees.

The Lindberghs, Wheelers, Hoovers, Norman Thomases, Coughlins and Hearsts represent only a handful of the American people. They are able to divide and confuse the masses, give the appearance of great strength only because they capitalize on the contradictory trends among large sections of the masses, who, while opposing Hitlerism, do not yet fully recognize the immediate menace of Hitlerism to the American people. An insufficiently bold policy of the Administration, certain appeasement influences even within the Administration, certain anti-Soviet trends among the anti-Hitler forces have contributed no little to the successes of the Lindberghs and Wheelers.

What is necessary is the establishment of full unity of the anti-Hitler forces, irrespective of differences on other issues, and a systematic struggle to win the masses to the full understanding of the situation; of the role of the American Quislings, and the need for an all-out effort to crush Hitlerism.

* * *

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The working class, the most progressive class in modern society, is the deadly enemy of fascism, the most reliable support of our democratic institutions, the backbone of the nation and its future. The American working class, the heart and soul of the American people, reared in the spirit of America's great war of independence and the Civil War against chattel slavery, has as a class fought many battles to preserve and extend our democratic institutions; it has fought, not only for its own interests, but for the welfare and progress of the entire people. That is why the working class of the United States is today almost unanimous in its opposition to Nazism, and for the military defeat of Hitler Germany. It stands in the forefront of the struggle for the freedom and independence of the American people.

But, unfortunately, the working class, which is almost unanimous in its hatred of and opposition to Hitlerism, has not yet fully mobilized its forces as the backbone of the *national front against Hitlerism.* To a large extent this is due to the fact that the working class is not yet more fully organized and united as an independent force. And it is precisely to the extent that the working class has made progress in organization and independence that it is emerging as a vital force in the building of the national front against Hitlerism. The main cause for the failure of the working class to play a greater role in the present situation lies in the weakness of leadership. The trade union movement has not yet drawn the full conclusions from the new world-shaking events following the Nazi attack on the Soviet Union—the merging of the Soviet Union's defense of its land with that of the other peoples fighting for their independence. It has not drawn the lessons as to the new dangers facing the American people.

In the tenth week of the heroic struggle of the Red Army against the Nazi hordes, we find that the C.I.O., the most powerful of the two trade union centers, has not yet spoken out. In this respect it must be declared that the statement of the A. F. of L. Council, recognizing the greater menace to the United States from the Hitler invasion of the U.S.S.R. and calling for American aid to the U.S.S.R., represents a most important and welcome development, despite the unfortunate fact that this stand was accompanied by the old slanders against the U.S.S.R. and the Communists. This step of the A. F. of L. Council only serves to emphasize the unsatisfactory situation with regard to the C.I.O.

How is this situation of the C.I.O. to be explained, epecially in the light of the fact that even the more conservative leaders of the A. F. of L. Council have spoken out? The C.I.O. through its national conventions as well as through its affiliates has time and again taken a stand against fascism. It has been in the forefront of the struggle for the organization of the workers, has defended their economic and political interests. But the C.I.O. as a whole has never in the past adopted a clear policy on foreign affairs. In the previous period, the Left and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

progressive forces who carried on an anti-imperialist policy collaborated with the Lewis trend, which was merely "isolationist." This situation, together with the existence within the C.I.O. of influential forces that from the beginning supported one side of what was then the imperialist war, brought about a situation in which there were compromises on specific questions regarding "national defense" policy, with no general foreign policy on the part of the C.I.O.

With the new situation created after the Nazi invasion of the U.S.S.R., there was clearly the need for the C.I.O., not only to speak out definitely but to take the lead in organizing the forces of labor—and through the unity of labor, help organize the national front against Hitlerism. This situation called for the collaboration of all the forces within the C.I.O. for the common goal, irrespective of the differences on important, but in this situation subordinate, issues. The Left-progressive forces within the C.I.O. through the leaders of some of the national C.I.O. affiliates, through various C.I.O. Councils, reacted correctly to the new situation, although not all these forces spoke out, and, above all, not in every case were words translated into deeds. The Hillman forces, because of the past relationship with other groups within the C.I.O., were unable immediately to effect a greater collaboration with all the other forces in support of the various steps proposed by the Administration and other measures called for by the new situation. The regrettable illness of President Philip Murray was another impediment to a quick reorientation of the C.I.O.

John L. Lewis, in the face of this situation, remained silent for the first seven weeks after the Nazi attack on the U.S.S.R. The Left-progressive forces naturally considered it their duty to try to influence Lewis' course, and it was at any rate clear that Lewis could not remain silent for long. He had to ally himself either with the forces fighting Hitler or against them. There is no middle ground in the present situation.

It can be said that the progressive forces awaited Lewis' stand with apprehension. For while he has in the recent years played a progressive role in the labor movement, he has never adopted a fully correct policy. This was true in the pre-Munich days and up to September, 1939, when the advanced sections of the labor movement fought for peace through collective security; it was true in the period between the outbreak of the war and the Nazi invasion of the U.S.S.R. Also, it was well known that Lewis has throughout this period retained very close associations with some powerful and reactionary industrial groups. It was also to be observed that Lewis' subjective reaction to Roosevelt and Hillman often colored and even determined his stand on issues, irrespective of their merits.

All these were negative factors. On the other hand, it was also known that Lewis had at various times spoken of the danger of fascism both abroad and at home. Lewis had, in fact, as far back as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Fifty-fifth A. F. of L. Convention (1935), motivated his plan for the organization of the unorganized and therefore of the C.I.O., on the experiences of the labor movement in Germany and Italy, and the danger from the fascist-minded capitalists in the United States. But what was particularly disturbing was Lewis' connections with such groups as the America First Committee, through the direct membership of his daughter, Kathryn Lewis.

Lewis finally spoke out on August 5, in company with the Hoovers, Landons, Lowdens, Daweses and other reactionary spokesmen, associating himself with the appeasement forces; with those who precisely in this new situation, in face of the increased menace of Hitlerism to the United States, are bringing aid to Hitler; with those who, like the Lindberghs, use anti-Soviet attacks as their main weapon for betrayal of our national interests. While Lewis' action did not come as a complete surprise to the progressive sections of the labor movement, they could not but be greatly shocked by it. This latest action of Lewis puts a new meaning also on his maneuvers with the Republican high command and with the Hoover forces, both prior to the Republican nomination convention and in the election campaign. It shows that that step then was not merely a "mistake."

If Lewis in his 1940 election maneuvers found himself isolated, could not win the support of even a single outstanding leader of the C.I.O., and certainly failed to win any substantial support among the rank and file, it can be said with certainty that this latest act of betrayal of the interests of labor will bring him even less support. If the Lindberghs, Wheelers, Hoovers, and Norman Thomases represent only a handful of the American people in general, Lewis will find in the ranks of labor, which is the deadly enemy of Hitlerism, even less support. But just as the Lindberghs and Wheelers are able to utilize certain confusion among the masses and exploit them for their pro-Hitlerite program, so can Lewis make use of certain unclarities that still exist in the ranks of labor.

Lewis will undoubtedly attempt to capitalize on his former progressive role, to exploit his close association with the progressive leaders and with the rank and file for the purpose of holding them back from uniting their ranks, from helping to establish national unity in the struggle against Hitlerism. He will especially try to make use of the increasing difficulties that the labor movement will face, try to use the effects of the transition to a defense economy, for the purpose of disorientating the workers. Just as the Wheelers, Lindberghs, etc., tried to stir up the armed forces against the draft extension bill, Lewis will try to utilize the difficulties arising from the operations of defense priorities. He will pose as the true champion of the workers' interests. He will also try to create the illusion that it is possible for those who favor the policy of an all-out struggle against Hitlerism to cooperate with him within the C.I.O. and within the country as a whole

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the Hillman forces in the C.I.O. and against the Administration, on purely so-called "domestic" questions. Were any of the progressive forces to entertain the illusion that such a couse is possible they would be falling into a most dangerous trap. It is not possible at any time and *certainly impossible today to separate the struggle of the workers' interests into two compartments: domestic and foreign.* The struggle against the menace of Hitlerism is a world-wide struggle and it is the immediate major task of the American people. It is the foremost and main task of the labor movement. On the outcome of this struggle will depend our whole future, our democratic institutions, the existence of a free trade union movement, our economic standards, everything that we cherish. *It is therefore absolutely impossible for the Left and progressive forces to collaborate with Lewis. What is necessary is a complete regrouping within the C.I.O. and in the whole labor movement on the basis of the unity of all forces in favor of a struggle against Hitlerism and against all those hindering this struggle.*

That there are dangers, that there are illusions among some progressives that irrespective of the new world situation, irrespective of Lewis' actions, it is possible to maintain the old alignment, is clearly shown by what happened at the U.A.W.A. convention in Buffalo the first weeks in August. The result was far from satisfactory. It is true that the convention re-emphasized its policy of aid to Britain and in the new situation came out in favor of government aid to the Soviet Union. This is a very important action and contrary to the Lewis policy which, in common with the Hoovers and Landons, is not only opposed to aid to the U.S.S.R., but even retracts its former position of aid to Britain on the ground that the "Anglo-Russian Alliance has dissipated the illusion" that this is a conflict "between tyranny and freedom." The stand of the U.A.W.A. convention, as far as it went, is correct and will help in the struggle against the Lewis policy and for the further unfolding of the anti-Hitler movement. But it is certainly disappointing in the face of the tasks of the United States. *It is not a policy of the full mobilization of all forces and resources for an all-out struggle for the military defeat of Hitler-Germany.* Had the regrouping required by the new situation taken place prior to the convention, the results would have been different. The maintenance of old alignments, the failure to carry through the regrouping of forces as demanded by the new situation, also affected the convention's decisions on a number of questions of domestic policy and directly or indirectly was a factor in the struggle for officers and the Executive Board.

The lessons of the U.A.W.A. convention should be taken to heart by the progressive forces in the C.I.O. and in the whole labor movement. They are a danger signal. They show the need for a full reorientation on the basis of the requirements of the new situation. They show the need for the unification of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all the forces within the C.I.O. on the basis of the main immediate task of the labor movement, which coincides with the main immediate task of the whole of the American people, with the interests of the entire nation.

Nor must the unity of the forces of labor in the interests of the *national front against Hitlerism* be limited to the C.I.O. All necessary measures must be taken to establish collaboration between the C.I.O., the A. F. of L. and the Railroad Brotherhoods, for the common struggle against the menace of Hitlerism to the freedom and independence of the U.S.A.

Only in this way, through the unity of labor in the interests of the struggle for the freedom, independence and welfare of the United States, can labor play the full role which is indispensible in the forging of a real *national front.* Only if labor, representing the majority of the American population, the most cohesive and best organized group in the nation, the most reliable and consistent fighter against fascism, fulfils its historic role, can the nation be truly united, can fascism be destroyed, can the pro-Hitlerites and appeasers in this country be defeated.

* * *

The unity of labor in the struggle against Hitlerism, the building of the *national front,* does not, of course, mean the abandonment of the struggle for labor's economic needs, does not in any sense mean the abandonment of the struggle for the people's well being and liberties. The Manifesto of the C.P. U.S.A. says:

"The true defense of the American people against its enemies at home and abroad demands a conscientious policy of steady improvement of the economic standards, the health, the general well being of the masses. It demands that the democratic liberties of the people be guarded, preserved and extended."

The working class, which in its own class interests must concentrate at this moment on the defense of the national interests of the entire people, for the defeat of the menace of Hitlerism, wishes to unite the entire people, irrespective of class, political opinion, race, creed or color, for the common struggle. It places no conditions for adherence to the national front—save one, the willingness to work for the destruction of the Hitler menace. Naturally this means that in this front there are capitalists as well as workers. The working class must continue to fight for the defense of its economic interests. It must oppose every effort of the capitalists to take advantage of the present situation for the purpose of advancing their class interests as against those of the workers. It must oppose any effort to weaken the organizations of labor. It must oppose any efforts to lower the living standards of the masses for the purpose of increasing the profits of the capitalists. It must oppose any efforts to increase taxes on low incomes for the purpose of lowering the taxes on the rich. It must oppose the rising cost of living brought about by greedy profiteers who wish to profit by the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plight of their country and the people. It must oppose all attempts to curb democratic liberties and fight for the maintenance and extension of the people's rights.

But this is not all that the working class is interested in at the present time. The working class, in the interests of national defense, in the interests of the struggle for the defeat of the Hitler menace, is interested more than any other group in the nation in securing the maximum production, in the shortest possible time, of all the material that is needed for our own armed forces as well as that needed for the fulfillment of our pledges of aid to those nations fighting Hitlerism.

In a country where there are no classes, like the socialist Soviet Union, the task of establishing national unity, including the task of the fullest mobilization of the masses for maximum production, presents no special problems, because there are no capitalists who privately own the industries and who would profit from the toil of the masses. There we have the maximum unity of the entire people. In such countries as Nazi Germany, a small handful of the most reactionary finance capitalists and their adventurous henchmen control the entire life of the country, the working class and all toilers are suppressed, the wages and hours of labor fixed arbitrarily by the capitalists and their government, the war being a source for the unprecedented enrichment of the capitalists and their henchmen. Our task here in the United States is to create the maximum national unity, to develop and maintain the maximum production in the defense industries, under conditions where capitalism exists, where there are classes that, aside from the immediate issue of the struggle against Hitlerism, have interests that are opposed to each other, and under conditions of democratic institutions which we must not only maintain but even extend as part of our defense effort.

On the one hand, the American people cannot and will not while carrying on a struggle against Hitlerism allow Hitler methods to be adopted within the country. We can only develop real national unity and the greatest enthusiasm among the masses by making clear in terms of living standards and democratic rights what the masses are defending, and why they must give their all in the struggle against Hitlerism. On the other hand, we cannot make a condition that capitalism be abolished in order that we carry through successfully the mobilization and the struggle against Hitlerism. This is not a war for socialism. It is a war for freedom and independence. It is this common objective that unites the whole people.

Under these circumstances, what we must do is to create the conditions which will both preserve the workers' rights and at the same time assure the maximum defense effort. This can only be done in a democratic way. The first condition for achieving this is the full enlightenment of the entire people on the issues involved, the dangers that we face. Without such clarity we shall not be able to establish real national unity and a maximum de-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fense effort. Secondly, it is necessary for the government to assure a minimum of well being to the people commensurate with our resources. Starving people in a land of plenty, where class distinctions exist and will perforce remain, is not conducive to the development of the best morale. This question must especially be faced in those industries that will suffer great unemployment as a result of the operations of the system of defense priorities. Failure to make the necessary adjustments here will only play into the hands of the pro-Hitler forces and the appeasers generally. Thirdly, it is necessary to assure and safeguard the right of organization to all workers. The better the workers are organized into their unions the better will they be able collectively and in a disciplined manner to fulfil their role in the interests of national defense. Fourthly, it is necessary to take measures against war profiteering and a rise in the cost of living. Taxation should be levied on the basis of the ability to pay. The workers, through direct and indirect taxes, are already bearing more than their share. And if the workers must make more sacrifices, they must be assured that these sacrifices are needed and will go towards the defense of the national interests and not into the pockets of the rich. If the workers, for example, increase production, they must be assured that this is not for the purpose of increasing the profits of the monopolists. And, finally, in order to carry through such a policy and to assure uninterrupted maximum production in the defense industries, there must be real labor representation on all bodies that have to do with national defense, not of a merely "consultative" character, as the so-called Labor Advisory Board of the O.P.M., but labor representatives chosen by the labor organizations themselves and on bodies that have power to determine both the policy and its execution. In this connection the Murray plan for industrial councils furnishes one of the important means to achieve this goal. Under such conditions it will be possible to settle all disputes that will inevitably arise without the adoption of the reactionary proposals to outlaw strikes, and without loss of valuable time in the defense effort, through negotiation and where necessary through mediation.

If all these steps are taken—and the working class through its trade union organizations must carry on a vigorous campaign for such a program—then we shall have realized one of the most important steps in the development of national unity and assure the maximum and enthusiastic effort on the part of the working class and the whole people for national defense, for the struggle against the menace of Hitlerism. Then it will become clear that it is not the working class, but the most reactionary sections of capital, the pro-Hitler and appeasement forces, the fascist-minded capitalists and their agents who sabotage the defense effort, who stand in the way of national unity, and who must be combatted to the utmost as part of the fight for national unity. This

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fact is most dramatically illustrated by the sabotage of the capitalists in the Federal Shipbuilding tie-up in Kearney, New Jersey. And if the Administration had acted against the management at least with the same dispatch that troops were unjustifiably used against the strikers in the North American aviation strike, the morale of the people would be enhanced immensely.

* * *

The Communist Party of the United States, as the party of the working class and as its most advanced section, proclaims the struggle for national unity, for the national front against Hitlerism, to be the main task of the working class today. To defend the freedom and independence of the American people, to champion the national interests of the American people as a whole is at present the best and *only* way in which both the immediate and ultimate class interests of the working class can be defended and advanced. In this policy the Communist Party is acting as a true Marxist party, in the spirit of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. It is carrying forward our Party's policy as developed under the guidance of our great leader, Earl Browder, who, more than any living American, has done so much to arm the working class with the rich traditions of our country, taught them how to utilize these traditions for the struggles of today. Our emphasis upon the national interests of the American people is in the best interests of the working class and has nothing in common with national chauvinism. It is, on the contrary, part of true internationalism. Our emphasis on national unity has nothing in common with the abandonment of the struggle for the interests of the working class, with class collaboration. It is, on the contrary, under present conditions the best defense of the class interests of the working class. The Communists, in the sense of *The Communist Manifesto*, written nearly a century ago by the founders of the modern socialist movement, in every struggle champion not the temporary interests of any section of the working class, but the ultimate interests of the entire working class. Today this demands that the Communists and the entire working class concentrate their all on the main immediate task of the defeat of Hitler and Hitlerism.

Our Party has been prepared to play its role, to fulfil its great responsibilities to the American people by the twenty-two years of its existence. Today, upon the occasion of the Party's anniversary (the Communist Party, U.S.A., was organized on Sept. 1, 1919), we are proud to be able as in the past and with even greater understanding and energy, to devote ourselves to the service of our class, our people, our country. And we pledge ourselves anew to leave nothing undone to win the immediate and unconditional freedom of our beloved comrade and leader, Earl Browder, so that he can resume his active role in the leadership of our Party. We are in these trying days ever mindful of the great contributions that Comrade Browder has made to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

development of that maturity of our Party which enables us to be of the greatest service to the American people. We are always remembering his teachings, his advice, studying again and again his speeches and writings, in order to learn how ever more effectively to fulfil our tasks. But each moment we are also mindful of his absence, mindful of how costly his imprisonment is, not only to our Party, but to the whole of the American people in this hour. In fighting for the freedom of Comrade Browder we are fighting, not for any narrow Party interests, not only against the injustice that has been done, not only against the danger that such persecutions represent to the American democracy, but also to establish in the shortest possible time the maximum unity of the American people in the struggle against the menace of Hitlerism. This is why the struggle for the freedom of Earl Browder is a burning issue, an issue that must be taken up by all opponents of Hitlerism.

Our Party, the Party of the American working class, because of its Marxist-Leninist policies, its history and tradition, was prepared for and able to reorientate itself quickly to the needs of the new situation; it was already able in the first two months to contribute greatly to the reorientation of the working class towards its new tasks, to help in the building of labor unity and the national front. But these times and the tasks that they place before us do not allow for any spirit of satisfaction with what has been accomplished. Rather do they call for the most critical examination of our work in order to determine and act upon those causes that have prevented a more rapid crystallization of labor unity, of national unity. Our Party must also take its share of responsibility for the weaknesses to be observed in the labor movement, for the unclarity which still exists, for the failure to realize fully the dangers and adopt measures to meet the new situation. Our Party must take its share of responsibility for the obstacles that still impede the more speedy unification of all the forces opposed to Hitler and Hitlerism.

What is it that has prevented our Party from acting more decisively on the issues that have arisen, from moving more rapidly in the direction of building the national front? It can be summed up by admitting that sectarian tendencies still prevail in many phases of our work. It is these sectarian tendencies that were expressed in the failure to undertake a more active campaign for the extension of the term of service for the selectees. It is these tendencies that are expressed in a reluctance in some circles to fight for aid to Britain and a desire to limit their activity for aid to the Soviet Union —a policy which in practice amounts to the same as the policy of those advocating aid to Britain but not to the Soviet Union, although approached from opposite ends. At the present stage in world history when the world coalition of peoples and nations is taking shape around the Soviet-British alliance against Hitlerism, every nation, every people fighting Hitlerism

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be given the fullest support.

This sectarian tendency is expressed in a failure on the part of many of our trade union forces to reorientate their work both with regard to the economic struggles and the inner relationship within the unions on the basis of the new situation. It is expressed in the slowness and even reluctance to bring about unity of action with those forces who were hitherto our opponents. All of these expressions of sectarianism disclose basically a lack of understanding of the present world situation, the changed character of the war, the immensity of the task in defeating Hitler, the real meaning of the *national front*.

The time has come when there can be no delay in ruthlessly combating these sectarian tendencies, which impede the progress of the struggle against Hitlerism. While Right opportunist dangers undoubtedly exist, and in some future time may even grow stronger; while it is necessary for the Party at all times to pursue an independent course, at the present time it is necessary to concentrate all fire against the danger of sectarianism. In this connection it must be said that while it was correct in the beginning to be patient with some of our allies who could not immediately make the necessary reorientation, we must not allow their hesitation in any way to influence our policies and tactics, they must not be allowed in any way to impede our efforts towards labor and national unity. We can in fact only save them from becoming aids of the pro-Hitler forces by our insistence that they put an end to all their policies that hinder the development of the national front against Hitlerism, for the complete military destruction of Hitler and Hitlerism.

We must also carry on a struggle against all tendencies to work and think in the old way, following the routine of "normal" times; we must combat any tendency to continue to see things and do things in terms of the old yardstick rather than in terms of the urgency of the present situation, in terms of the demands of the hour. This must be true in all work. It must be true in work in the trade unions and other mass organizations, in our agitation and propaganda, in the building of the circulation of our press and literature and especially of the *Daily Worker* and *Sunday Worker*. At this moment when the Soviet people and the Red Army are making such great sacrifices in the interests of all humanity, in our own interests, it is the duty of every class-conscious worker and certainly of every Communist, to work constantly and untiringly, to work not as of old but in a new way. Our Party membership, which, when given the lead, has responded most splendidly, must be afforded the opportunity to use all its strength and resources and by its work and sacrifices set an example to all the people.

The Communist Party, in this crucial moment in the history of the world and our land, joins with the people and takes its place in the front lines of the struggle for the complete mobilization of all our people and our resources for the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maximum effort, for an all-out struggle to defend our freedom and independence, to ward off the menace of Hitler and Hitlerism, to crush and annihilate the Nazi beast. In this historic task our Party has no partisan interests. It seeks no special privileges. It seeks to gain no special advantages. In this our Party carries forward the best traditions of the American War of Independence, of the Civil War against chattel slavery. It works for the national interests of our people and our country in the same unselfish way as do the Communists of the great Soviet Union, the Chinese Communists, the French Communists, the British Communists and the Communists of all lands. We are confident that when the people of the world have in common struggle put an end once and for all to the Nazi menace, then the American people, like the people in the other capitalist countries, will have advanced and will carry forward the struggle for a world really free, a world without fascism and war, a world where there will be freedom, progress, peace and plenty.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MUNICH AND ANTI-MUNICH

SEPTEMBER, 1938, TO SEPTEMBER, 1941

BY ROBERT MINOR

I.

THE Munich Pact of September, 1938, led its signatories into war within the first year.

Within the second year of the pact of "peace in our time" most of the nations of Europe had lost their sovereignty.

At the dawn of the third year since Munich the United States had passed from the small volunteer army system to the system of universal compulsory military service. Its industrial plant, the most potent of a single nation in the world, became decisively integrated with the war operations in Europe; the British struggle with Germany became an Anglo-American struggle with Germany. The foreign policy of the United States passed from formal neutrality to undeclared war. The Second Imperialist War had spread in essential fact to every continent; it became a struggle for redivision of the world in which every colonial possession and source of raw material was again placed at stake for military combat; all spheres of influence became spheres of military confrontation, and all imperialist relations of strong powers with weaker powers were reasserted and tightened in a firmer grip, in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, in Latin America.

* * *

On June 22 of this year the only great power that had remained neutral—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—was forcibly drawn into the war. By its inclusion among belligerents a profound change was made in all aspects of the war.

The war became universal among all great states, and the entire area of all continents, with the ephemeral exception of Latin America, became belligerent territory. The United States and all nations were placed before the alternative of German Nazi world conquest or the military crushing of Nazi Germany.

A profound change of the political character of the war results from the inclusion of the great non-imperialist state among the belligerents. Visions of imperialist treaties as the result of a new Allied victory, such as the treaty of Versailles that enslaved Germany in 1918, the Treaty of St. Germain that enslaved Austria, that of Neuilly that enslaved Bulgaria, the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Treaty of the Grand Trianon that enslaved Hungary, or that of Sèvres by which Turkey was enslaved—such visions are dispelled by the inclusion of the Soviet Union among the powers which, with England and America, will crush the Nazi power.

The Second World War has ceased to be a war between two imperialist groups for the redivision of the world; it has become a war of all peoples for national independence and liberation from German fascist enslavement. This is disputed by the understudies of Goebbels and Trotsky, who have flooded the world with the myth of "red imperialism." But the peoples of all countries know instinctively that it is true, and it is proven by the uniform wave of incipient revolt in all conquered countries on receipt of the news that the Red Army was at war against Hitler.

Even the most rudimentary and instinctive feeling among the people as to the historic character of the U.S.S.R. has brought to the whole of Europe the understanding that the victory of the British, American and the Soviet Russian arms in this war will not endanger the independence or liberty of a single nation in the world. Instantly that the Soviet Union became a belligerent every German knew that a defeat of Hitler would not result in a new Versailles Treaty. The course of the Polish government in exile shows that every Pole knows that his country will be free and independent with the victory of that alignment of powers which is now either fighting or preparing to fight for the destruction of the Hitler state. Not only the peoples of Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Greece, but also those of Hungary and Italy know now for the first time that there will be no loss of the independence and freedom of their nations with the victory of the anti-Hitler cause of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union.

That is the political side.

* * *

Examine the military side.

The German armies that conquered France in thirty-nine days and all of western Europe in seventy-six days met their first formidable foe in the Soviet Red Army. The largest military actions of all history developed from the resistance of the Red Army. They are actions many times larger than our own country's forces have ever seen, actions in which ten million men with huge mechanical instruments of war produced by years of military construction conduct battle a hundred miles deep on a front 2,000 miles long, from the Arctic Ocean to the Black Sea. Between that colossal combat and the territory of the United States there is no non-belligerent territory. Defeat of the Soviet Union would bring the German armies and machines of war within five miles of the shores of Alaska. Such defeat would place control of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans in the hands of a dictator having at his disposal the captive war fleets of all Europe and the Navy of Japan.

The industrial plant of the United States is the largest of any single

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nation, but it is not larger than those of all Europe and Asia. Against the Soviet Union Hitler is utilizing for military purposes the combined industrial plants and resources of seventeen nations. If he succeeded in his present campaign against Soviet Russia and England he would operate in war against the United States the industrial plants of the entire remaining world and the resources of all existing colonies.

German victory over Soviet Russia would immediately be followed by the fall of Great Britain, of Turkey, Iran, India and China.

What strong powers, beside ourselves, would remain to face the German-Japanese rulers of Europe and Asia?

There are none in the world.

The next power in size and strength would be Brazil. After it, in the order of their man power, would come Spain, then Portugal, Mexico, Egypt, Turkey, Ethiopia, Argentina and Canada. Beyond these would be the category of the Union of South Africa and Australia. None of these powers could stand for even a serious number of days against what the German-Italian-Japanese forces would consider a military expedition of secondary strength.

This is the case as stated in the plainest, unimaginative military terms. But military terms are always one-sided. The political consideration looms high above the consideration in military terms. The downfall of the U.S.S.R. and its consequence in the downfall of England would mean, despite all the slanders directed against that socialist state, the extinction of the last great state in the old world in which men and women exercise the right of political franchise and popular mass organization. The effects would be of the kind that the German government knows how to exploit both in the old World and in the Western Hemisphere.

* * *

The Munich Pact of September, 1938, disposed of the fate of Czechoslovakia in a conference of four powers—Great Britain, France, Germany and Italy—from which Czechoslovakia was excluded along with her only strong friend, Soviet Russia. The four powers dismembered Czechoslovakia by giving to Hitler her huge Sudeten Mountain fortifications with their armaments that formed the first bastion obstructing a German move eastward; and the possession of Czechoslovakia's fortifications and their heavy armaments gave Hitler an easy option on seizure of all the rest of the military resources and territory of that country. This gift placed in Hitler's hands the military hegemony of Europe and by it he was enabled to transform Rumania, Poland and Czechoslovakia into an open military road to the borders of the Soviet Union.

There were two military roads opened by the Munich Pact. One was the road to the Soviet border, which Hitler promised would be his path. The other was a road to Paris and Brussels and Amsterdam, and the English Channel, which Hitler promised not to travel.

This strangest of all treaties was

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a voluntary subordination of the national interests of Great Britain and France to the imperialist interests of a foreign power—the submission of their national security to the mercy of a foreign state. Great Britain and France deliberately made German military power stronger than their own. Sections of the wealthiest classes under the influence of the fascist cult, known in England as the Cliveden Set and in France as the 200 Families, felt their property interests safer under the protection of a foreign dictator, a "gendarme of Europe," than subject to the relatively democratic political systems of France and England.

* * *

The Munich Pact sacrificed the national interest of the United States along with that of Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, Poland, Great Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Norway and the rest of Europe.

But the policy of the United States at that time was not to oppose but rather to support it. The morning after the signing of the treaty the press reported from Washington "a universal sense of relief" and quoted anonymous officials as saying "At last after twenty years a balance of power has been established in Europe." Athough Secretary of State Cordell Hull expressed some uneasiness, the advice of Chamberlain, cabled from London—"Go home and get a nice quiet sleep"—was accepted as policy.

* * *

In England among the leaders of political parties there were some who opposed the Munich Pact. In France the opposition to it came almost exclusively from the Communist Party and the sections of the masses close to the Communists.

In the United States not a single national leader of a political party denounced the Munich Pact or gave warning that it endangered the security of the nation except the leaders of the Communist Party.

At the moment of the famous airplane flight to Berchtesgaden, Earl Browder, as General Secretary of the Communist Party, said of the forthcoming deal with Hitler

"It is the blackest and most open treason ever registered in modern history. Through the betrayal of Czechoslovakia world peace and democracy are to be betrayed."

Twelve days after the signing of the treaty Browder sent from Paris a message in which he analyzed what he called "the new reactionary bloc formed at Munich" from the point of view of the national interest of the United States, forecasting as the next step "an attempt to liquidate the Spanish Republic . . . to secure the key to the great Latin American continent," and warning as well that "with the strengthening of the hands of Japanese imperialism they hope to close the doors to the Pacific." If one remembers that the British government of which Browder spoke was the Chamberlain government at the height of its Munich policy, one can accept without the change of a syllable the following words about the character and effects of the Munich Pact, and can wish with all one's heart that the policy he

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

outlined then had been followed by our country:

"In September, at the time of the highest point of the crisis evoked by Hitler's threats of aggression against Czechoslovakia, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, twice intervened in the European conflict. His appeal for peace and his proposal to convene an international conference for settlement of the questions in dispute were a very important refutation of those who wish to make out that the United States will in all circumstances keep to its policy of isolation. It is also clear, however, that this intervention by President Roosevelt was determined not by general humanitarian or pacifist considerations, but above all by the interests of America and recognition of the fact that two oceans alone are not capable of protecting the United States of America from the expansionist designs of the fascist bloc.

"As a matter of fact, as a result of the new reactionary bloc formed at Munich, which seriously changed the international situation, drawing into the anti-democratic, counter-revolutionary bloc the imperialist reactionary forces of Great Britain and France, the role of the United States and of the Americas becomes even more decisive. The Munich bloc, following the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, is proceeding next to attempt to liquidate the Spanish republic.

"At the same time the capitulation of the Western powers to Hitler, the attempt of Chamberlain and Daladier to adapt Britain and France to the expansionist efforts of Hitler's 'world political triangle,' will unquestionably also strengthen the hands of the Japanese militarists in their drive for the conquest of China and the Pacific. Thus the menace of fascism, hitherto considered by the United States as primarily a European problem, becomes worldwide and directly strikes against the national interests of the U.S.A. and against American democracy.

"The fight between democracy and fascism for Spain has a far greater importance for the American continent that might seem at the first glance. Having closed the doors of Europe against the U.S.A., fascism hopes in Spain to secure the key to the great Latin American continent, which, with the collaboration or the neutrality of the British Navy, it considers ripe for conquest, and with the strengthening of the hands of Japanese imperialism they hope to close the doors of the Pacific. . . .

"The democracy of the U.S.A. is faced with the necessity to choose its course, either of surrender or of struggle—a struggle in which victory is possible only on condition of close alliance with the forces of peace and democracy in all lands.

"The question of the relationship between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union becomes of first and most pressing importance. It is necessary to bring out clearly and to stress the many common interests of these two great lands, their many parallel characteristics, the common enemies of both." *

Three years ago that was the opinion of Earl Browder. Today it is the opinion of every honest American. There is no mystery about it: Browder is not a magician. He simply understood that the firm basis of national interest must underly every correct proposal of policy for the course of a nation, and that the true interest of our nation

* Earl Browder, *Fighting for Peace*, International Publishers, pp. 167-68.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can never be contrary to the broadest and deepest interest of other peoples.

* * *

But the foreign policy of the United States followed Chamberlain to Munich. Americans influential enough to turn the course of the nation were drawn into the intrigues of the "Rasputins" of Berlin, Paris and London. Reactionary elements that had gotten over their first fright of the economic crisis and their momentary tolerance to concessions of social reforms had come to regard the New Deal as unnecessary, costly and dangerous, as a concession to an American rabble that was mainly leaning on shovels, and that ought to be gotten rid of along with the *Front Populair* of France, the *Frente Popular* of Spain, or even the Bolshevism of Russia. Hitler's method of dealing with the trade unions began to be more popular in some of the apartments of Park Avenue than the Wagner Act, and his burning of books and imprisonment of Communist leaders a model for the United States. Some of the foremost industrialists returning from Europe praised Hitler as a strong and constructive statesman.

Lindbergh's emergence from Moscow and Berlin with the sensational announcement that the Red Army was weak and the Red Air Force made of vegetable crates fitted in with the already powerful agitation in France, England and the United States for the rejection by these countries of all cooperation with the Soviet State, which everyone knows now was the strongest power in Europe and Asia, without whose cooperation there could be no serious thought of countering the rising might of the Berlin-Rome-Tokio Axis. When the Axis was formed in November, 1936, the German foreign office played the cruel joke of calling it the "Anti-Comintern Axis" for effect in Park Avenue, the Cliveden Set and the Boulevard St. Germain. Ambassador Bullitt made heavy use of the "Anti-Comintern Axis" idea and the Lindbergh story to encourage the French government to tear up its pact of mutual aid to the "weak" and "Un-Christian" Soviet Union, to turn France's face to Germany and to take the road that led through Munich and Warsaw and Dunkirk to Vichy.

* * *

When after one year the consequences of Munich began to flame from the mouths of German cannon in Western Europe and a week to ten days became the accepted norm of time to complete the conquest of a nation, and Dunkirk was followed in three weeks by the fall of France and then a full year of British disaster, a spirit of pessimism pervaded the American press. A pro-British expert wrote:

"British sea-power is waging a losing battle in the Atlantic. The Nazis are sinking more than twice as many tons as are being built." (Wm. Philip Simms, *N. Y. World-Telegram,* April, 1941.)

And another said:

". . . the last foothold on the continent of Europe is slipping." (Raymond Clapper, *N. Y. World-Telegram,* April, 1941.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A partisan of the Allied cause wrote that "the effects of an Allied disaster have almost blotted out the Presidential campaign," and speculated upon a maximum hope that "the Allies should by a miracle hold on and drive the war into a stalemate."

The foregoing quotations show how the press saw the purely military question of victory or defeat as between the two sides prior to June 22, 1941. Why do we dwell upon this? Because it confirms what we have said of the nature of the Munich Pact and the inevitable ruin resulting from the policy by which the friendship and mutual aid of the Soviet Union were rejected and the security of the world placed at the mercy of Nazi reaction, and because that ruinous policy still has powerful defenders and may yet bring unspeakable ruin to this country.

* * *

The great all-decisive fact that the involvement of the Soviet Union by the Nazi attack on June 22 worked a complete transformation of the entire war situation, and places in jeopardy the independence and life of every nation in the world—and not least of all the United States and Great Britain—was not at first seen by many.

This is because the minds of the bourgeois world were sodden with the Munich theory. For instance, General Hugh Johnson, author of the now inconspicuous doctrine that "the Russian Army is mush" said on June 21, the day before Hitler attacked the Soviet Union, "If the Nazis start fighting Russia, what a break for Britain! What a break for us, if . . ."

The essential theory of Munich was that the German military power should be turned to war against the Soviet Union, that the German military efforts would be absorbed in Russia and the German appetite for land and loot satisfied there, being thus diverted from the rest of the world, leaving France and Belgium, England and America undisturbed.

The Munich lie was that all the rest of the world would derive an advantage from the involvement of the Soviet Union in the war. "What a break! . . ."

But all intelligent persons are compelled to see now that the involvement of the Soviet Union is not a "break" but the greatest menace to the life of the United States; that the defeat of the Soviet Union would mean absolutely certain and easy conquest of England and even the compulsion of strategic military necessity on Germany's part to occupy and disarm England and Ireland.

"Germany . . . is carrying on her present conquest with the loot of past conquests and with the product of the labor of enslaved nations . . . Germany must obtain further loot by further conquests or else she will begin to slide backwards into restlessness, revolt and failure. . . . Our own hemisphere, thinly populated, rich beyond all other continents in natural resources, is an inevitable ultimate target for these marauder nations. . . . If Hitler succeeds in conquering Western Russia he will have under his control 100,000,000 more [of population]. The American gov-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernment which failed to take measures of protection against such a dire prospect for the future would be faithless, indeed, to the interests of its people." (Secretary Stimson's speech to draftees, Washington, Aug. 15, 1941.)

Most intelligent Americans have abandoned the Munich idea that the precipitation of the bloody war against Soviet Russia affords an advantage to our country, and now understand that the assault upon Soviet Russia brings most dire peril to the United States and Great Britain and all peoples.

That which brought advantage to America and the world is the terrific and stubborn fighting of the Red Army, which has surprised everyone in the world except those countless millions of conscious men and women of the working class who instinctively know how it gets that way.

* * *

As soon as the Red Army began to show the world how to fight, the pessimism of the bourgeois press about the Allied cause began to vanish in astonishment. The press did not concern itself with the Soviet Army except as the military prospects of the British were affected. As *The New York Times* expressed it after watching the Red Army make war six weeks and sabotage and resistance flare up in the occupied countries in response to it:

"Europe begins to take courage." (*N. Y. Times,* July 29, 1941.)

The *New York Herald Tribune* noted that the Red Army's fighting had surprised the experts and that a tide of rebellion was at last arising among the conquered peoples; it saw "new offensive energies stirring among the British," and remarked:

"Whatever lies immediately ahead, these, already, have been six crucial weeks in the history of Western civilization. The danger now is not in hoping too much; it is in realizing too little the immense change they have wrought and the immense opportunity they have opened—for those who will seize it."

Here we begin to get the anti-Munich pattern:

The advantage to the world is not *in the involvement of the Soviet* Union in the war, as the Munich makers contended; the advantage to humanity lay in the fighting of the Soviet Army. As the manifesto of the Communist Party put it, the attack on the Soviet Union—

". . . immeasurably increased the menace of Hitler and fascism to the national existence of all peoples, to the social and national security of the people of the United States. . . . The glorious and mighty defense by the Red Army and the united peoples of the Soviet Union, their valiant struggle to drive out and crush the aggressor, create the opportunity for the people of the United States and for all peoples to unite and assure the complete and final annihilation of Hitler and Hitlerism."

But the opportunity arising from the magnificent fighting capacity of the Red Army is *only "for those who will seize it."*

Anti-Munich is to be found in those words of the *Herald Tribune.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Immense opportunity" has been opened by the first two months of fighting by the Red Army. But the turn of the tide is only for those who will seize this opportunity. Otherwise it is not opportunity but death for the peoples of the world.

II.

When the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain met at sea and planned the pooling of strength of the two nations with that of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the war—they indicated a turn in the reverse direction from the road of ruin that had been followed for the past six years, or more especially for the two and one-half years beginning with the Munich Treaty in September, 1938, and extending into the war period, during which all of the affairs of Europe were approached from London and Paris, almost as much as from Berlin, Rome and Tokyo, in a manner influenced by the Munich pattern.

If Roosevelt and Churchill acted to turn the two countries decisively away from that path, it is because that path leads toward death for these two nations. The epoch of the butchery of Ethiopia, the slaughter of the Spanish Republic, the betrayal of Austria, the selling of Czechoslovakia, the false promise to Poland, the Pickwickian declaration of war in September, 1939, that was followed by seven months of undeclared armistice during which the governments of Chamberlain and Daladier attempted no defense of their own nations but only to "switch" the war to the Soviet Union; and then the catastrophic military débâcle in which the German advance was aided by a decisive section of French officers, and the sweeping removal of French generals by a "Munich" government of France was arranged to place the command of the French Army for the final stage totally in the hands of the *Cagoulards* (French Hitlerites)—this epoch had to continue to the engulfment of England and America, or it had to be ended.

Roosevelt and Churchill say it must be ended.

* * *

Every American must understand in all its realism and in all its consequences the fact that the policy announced by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill is based upon the national interest of the United States and that of Great Britain, and nothing else.

We must understand this thoroughly. Any proposals or expectations that the governments of the United States and Great Britain may act in a manner motivated by "altruistic" conceptions in regard to other states can bring nothing but self-deception.

The only alternative is resumption of the Munich path—a policy based upon a narrowly-conceived and short-sighted interest of a sort of "Rasputinized" section of finance capital so closely allied with German interests, or so feverishly involved in the cult and international scheming of fascism, as to have lost all primary concern for the general national interest of its country. That alternative is being discarded by this country and England because these two countries have at last been forced to see that their national interest was being wrecked

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the Munich policy. The policy of this country and of England is now turning to the service of the national interest of each.

The policy offered and supported by the Communist Party throughout this crisis and the period of its development from 1936 has always been the anti-Munich policy which is now generally recognized as indispensable to the national interest of the United States. The policy we advocate now and have advocated throughout this crisis has coincided with the interests of other countries because it is to the mutual interest of the United States and its friends among the peoples. Communists always adhere stubbornly to the principle and practice of international solidarity of the working classes of all countries, it is true; but Communists are never so blind as to offer the country a foreign policy that is contradictory to the national interest. For instance, when the British working class in 1861-65, with the support and inspiration of the First International and its Communist leaders, deliberately went through a hell of unemployment and suffering rather than permit the proposed intervention in behalf of the slave-owners' insurrection against the United States, the British workers' policy was in accord with the truly-conceived national interest of their own country. The British workers were accused, it is true, of supporting the "foreign dictator" Lincoln in disregard of the national interest of their own country, but that was historically untrue.

The support that was given by the State Department and its Ambassador in Paris to the breaking of France's friendship and mutual aid pact with Soviet Russia and to the signing of the Pact of Munich with the annihilation of Czechoslovakia and the flattening out of Poland into a military road to Smolensk, was then conceived by many to be perhaps cold-bloodedly realistic, but in the national interest of the United States, because it both helped to build a "wall against Bolshevism" and assured "peace in our time." But now everyone knows that the policy pursued by Bullitt in Paris was neither realistic, nor in the national interest of the United States, nor did it even permit the sightest chance of peace.

* * *

The Munich policy was always opposed to the national interest of the United States.

The proposal put forward by Hitler in his famous Reichstag speech in May, 1935, that Nazi terror against "Jewish Bolshevism" be elevated to the principle for policing Europe through elevating Germany to military hegemony of Europe—was accepted by the Cliveden Set as an arrangement of partnership of four sovereign Great Powers, *i.e.*, of Britain, France and Italy, with what the *London Times* forecast as "a free, equal and strong Germany." There was to be a division of labor: England to continue to rule the seas and grow rich in undisturbed possession of her colonies, France to continue as the usurer of Europe, and "strong" Germany to be entrusted with the military power necessary for her defense of Europe against "Russian barbarism."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The picture of four great and equal imperialist partners has faded in the glaring light of reality. The reality is the rule of Europe by Hitler and the extension of that rule to the world. The reality shows how the other powers may "cooperate." It can only be done the way that Vichy France is "cooperating," as a chained and broken slave. Italy "cooperates" while German forces keep order on Italian soil. Rumania, Hungary and Bulgaria "cooperate." An agreement between a Hitler Germany and a Cliveden England could only be the completion of the arrangement already made between Germany and France. In a figurative sense Cliveden would become the capital of England as Vichy has become the capital of France. That British seamen would not be trusted with the British Navy is obvious.

In the time of Baldwin and Chamberlain England had been pledged to participation with Germany, Italy and France in controlling Europe's affairs on the assumption that she could do so as a sovereign nation. Today England knows that Germany must have guarantees. Germany does not take paper guarantees. She must have the most tangible of guarantees, which are made of stone and steel and concrete. The British Navy is the first of such guarantees. Germany would have to be assured in a physical way, and not in words, on her western front, while she attempted to overpower Soviet Russia; and the surrender of a decisive part of the British Navy would be that guarantee.

It would be a guarantee of control of the seas. It would be a guarantee of access—commercial and military—to the Western Hemisphere.

A Munich of 1941 therefore would be vastly different from the Munich of 1939, in that it necessarily would openly, before the eyes of the whole world, be aimed directly at military crushing of the United States.

The most decisive of all facts in the world today is that the only possible peace that the United States can have with the Hitler government is the kind of peace that is now had by France. As President Roosevelt said:

"Inevitably, such a peace would be a gift to Nazism to take breath—armed breath—for a second war to extend the control over Europe and Asia to the American Hemisphere itself."

A "Lindbergh" collaboration with Hitler by the United States could not but include acquiescence in Germany's domination of Latin America and Japanese-German domination of all of Asia. It is not an accident that both Hoover and Lindbergh expressed the early basis of their policy by advocating that Germany and Japan be permitted to "share" in the "development" of Latin America. We know it would mean first of all development of naval and air bases. It would mean the same old Munich process of placing the security of the United States and the twenty Latin American republics at the mercy of Nazi Germany by giving the Hitler government the military means with which to enforce dominance.

That is what President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill found

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out, and it is the basis of the entirely realistic policy of defense of the United States which President Roosevelt made with Churchill at the conference on the high seas.

But the promise of the conference remains to be fulfilled in terms of annihilating action.

* * *

About 125 years ago the famous military writer Clausewitz wrote his famous book *On War,* which was largely a digest of the lessons learned in the quarter century of wars of European nations with Napoleon. We quote a pasage from that book that reads as though it were written after June 22, 1941, as a result of a study of the present attempt of Nazi Germany to conquer not only Europe but the world. Clausewitz said that "two fundamental principles reign through the whole plan of War, and serve as a guide for everything else." He continued:

"The first is: to reduce the weight of the enemy's power into as few centers of gravity as possible, into one if it can be done; again, to confine the attack against these centers of force to as few principal undertakings as possible, to one if possible; lastly to keep all secondary undertakings as subordinate as possible. In a word, the first principle is, *to concentrate as much as possible.*

"The second principle runs thus—to act as swiftly as possible, therefore, to allow of no delay or detour without sufficient reason.

"The reducing of the enemy's power to one central point depends—

"(1) On the nature of its political connection. If it consists of Armies of one Power, there is generally no difficulty; if of allied Armies, of which one is acting simply as an ally without any interest of its own, then the difficulty is not much greater; if of a coalition for a common object, then it depends on the cordiality of the alliance. . . ." (Clausewitz, *On War,* Kegan Paul, London, 1911, Vol. III, p. 141.)

The greatness of Clausewitz consisted partly in his ability always to understand that war is the continuation of political struggle by means of military instruments. He knew, therefore, that a power attempting to conquer and to maintain conquest of Europe would depend for its success upon certain weaknesses in the unity of the victims against the conqueror. In a struggle against "a coalition for a common object" a would-be conqueror of Europe would have to estimate his chance of defeat as depending upon "the cordiality of the alliance" of his intended victims.

Looking back at the end of the third year since the Munich Treaty, one can see that there has never been a unity of nations against conquest by Hitler; and if there is a degree of unity now, a coalition for a common object, all who are interested in defeating the new "Napoleon" must look to the "cordiality of the alliance."

Nazi Germany, transformed by its conquests into the strongest military power ever known, has a German army of eleven million men which is being supplied by the twenty-four-hour day capacity production of the national manufacturing plants of all five of the great

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

armament manufacturing countries of continental Europe. Hitler's armies have free disposal of the economic resources of seventeen enslaved nations of 270,000,000 population. Hitler is throwing this greatest concentration of military force of all time against a single national link in the world's defenses.

This is, of course, the most perfect realization of the "first principle" named by Clausewitz to reduce the weight of the enemy's power into one center of gravity; to confine the attack to one principal undertaking; that is, to concentrate the full weight of many nations' resources upon one single front, in order to crush that front and then to proceed to the next.

* * *

There must be full popular understanding of the matter of national interest and security of the United States.

The only possibility for the United States to get out and stay out of the war lay in the neutrality of the Soviet Union. When that neutrality ended, the security of the United States ended.

The possibility peacefully to guard the security of the United States lay in the fact that the 6,000 miles of territory between the Baltic Sea and the Alaskan shore were held by a powerful state of non-imperialist character, which shared none of the war-motives of either belligerent and refused to be drawn into the war, while rapidly increasing its military and economic strength. The existence of the Soviet Union in this capacity ensured not only that Hitler could not move eastward to strike root in richer sources of economic strength, but also that he could not move westward on major adventures without trusting his eastern frontier to a purely diplomatic protection of the type on which military science never depends.

The security of Latin America from German aggression lay in the fact that the German army, navy and air force were not adequate for the enormous Dakar-to-Brazil undertaking or the Dakar-to-Rio Plate expedition while "tying up" a huge German force on a borderline of conquered Yugoslavs, Bulgarians, Czechoslovaks, Poles, Rumanians, Hungarians face to face with the Soviet Union, the symbol, to these peoples seething against their subjugation, of freedom and national integrity. It is now evident that the German Government believed it could not undertake the crossing of the English Channel while its eastern border remained in that condition. The remarks of Hitler on this subject in his speech of June 22 are revealing, despite their distortion.

Hitler piled conquest upon conquest. But the higher the imposing pile of conquered nations rose, the more unreal became the idea that it could have any permanence as long as the Soviet Union towered above it. In this sense a statement of the Communist Party of Argentina on June 23 is enlightening: ". . . the consistent peace policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics constituted an extraordinary encouragement to resistence by the European peoples against the Nazi-fascist aggression that had already

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enslaved the peoples of France, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Yugoslavia, Greece and other nations."

The consequences of neutrality of the Soviet Union, therefore, included not only a check against the spread of the war to the Western Hemisphere and against a war in the Pacific, but also the generation of a popular mass basis for liberation of the conquered peoples of Europe. Against this statement reactionaries will wrathfully exclaim: Why didn't Soviet Russia accomplish all this at the beginning, in August, 1939? It is necessary to diverge a moment to reply to this. The answer is that there proved to be no possibility of such united resistence to Hitler in August, 1939. The hope of a united front of peoples against Hitler vanished then when the French and British Governments, speaking for themselves and the Baltic governments which they controlled in the matter, rejected the Soviet Government's proposed military and naval accord by which the Red Army and Navy were to meet the German attack at the Polish-German frontier and to operate from Esthonian, Latvian and Lithuanian warm-water ports. That rejection revealed the fact that the British and French Governments did not have an undivided purpose. The statesmanship of Cliveden wanted Hitler's armies to begin fighting the Red Army, not at the western border of Poland but at the eastern Polish border 200 miles nearer to Moscow; and Hitler's warships to fight the Red fleet not at Tallinn and the Gulf of Riga, but at Kronstadt within gunshot of Leningrad. The rejection of all serious military and naval proposals showed that London and Paris were still preoccupied with the Munich plan: they still conceived of the role of the Soviet Union as one of *absorbing*, by being conquered by, the German armies. The German forces were to be kept from Paris and Brussels by being drawn deep into a conquest of the Soviet Union. Any doubt of this would be removed by the fact that for seven months from the declaration of war on Sept. 3, 1939, to April, 1940, the Chamberlain and Daladier governments maintained a virtual unofficial armistice with Hitler, preventing any but light skirmishing between patrols on the German border, still hoping for a turning of Hitler's forces against the Soviet Union. Beyond the slightest doubt the involvement of the Soviet Union would have resulted in the continuation of the inactive western front and a withdrawal of England and France from the war, in conformity to the original Munich plan. That Hitler could not be induced to turn eastward after taking Poland was due to his knowledge that the soft front was in the west, that the unity of France had been disintegrated by the Munich poison, that the French people had no means of defending their national interest through a "French" government of Hitler's friends Daladier, Reynaud and Pétain; through his knowledge that the friends of Hess and Ribbentrop were still within reach in England and that through the Englishmen he had met at Munich there would be no single-purposed defense of British national interest; through

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his knowledge that the Red Army was the hard spot, though he did not yet half know how hard.

When the German dictator, choosing his own time and place by permission of Chamberlain and Daladier, began serious fighting, the softness of the resistance of the various states attacked showed that these states were not then capable of serving as organizers of a general European defense against Nazi aggression. The Munich corruption opened the French front at Sedan and the "French State" at Vichy became but an agency of espionage and assassination for the foreign conqueror. Bucharest proved a sink-hole of rottenness, and in Bulgaria there was not yet a predominance of patriotism and national interest over the fifth column. Yugoslavia's magnificent resistance was only a flaring up of a will to resistance that still lay prostrate in Europe generally under the Pétains of many countries.

The entry of the United States as a virtual belligerent under those conditions added to the military strength of the British cause, but did not serve to change the character of the war. *There was no popular response in the occupied countries.* The entrance of the Soviet Union into the war was sought most ardently in both England and America as a means of taking the burden off England and America. Soviet Russian military action was sought as an *alternative* to British and American military action, which was of course the continuation of the Munich motif. This was less apparent in the case of the British approach than in the American; but to this day, in the United States, the pro-Hitler press rejoices that Germany attacked Soviet Russia and claims that there is now no need to worry about Hitler.

Mark this clearly: All who speak of the military action of the Soviet Union as an *alternative* to military action of the United States are playing the Munich game of Hitler.

The policy of the Soviet Union in preserving neutrality was best, not only for the security and national interest of its own people, plus the security of other countries including the United States and the whole Western Hemisphere, but also for the development of the possibility of a united struggle against Nazi conquest of the world, in the event that neutrality was to be ended.

Mr. Churchill was in error when he said:

"Russia was cajoled and deceived into a kind of neutrality or partnership while the French Army was being annihilated."

The neutrality of the Soviet Union was the alternative, not to a united front of nations against Hitler, but to a war in 1939 of the Soviet Union alone versus Germany. If war was to come later anyway, the Soviet Union would be still stronger and it might even be possible to attain a united struggle such as France and England rejected in August, 1939. The interim of time unfortunately had to be consumed in the terrible process by which all nations were given the lesson by Hitler himself as to what constituted his "simple dismal plan."

Stalin was correct in his famous broadcast in the first days of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hitler attack, in denying that the "non-aggression pact with such fiends as Hitler and Ribbentrop" was "an error of the Soviet Government." The Soviet Union secured for itself, as Stalin said: ". . . peace for a year and a half, and the opportunity of preparing its forces to repulse fascist Germany should she risk an attack on our country despite the pact."

* * *

"The bombing airplane already has a range of several thousand miles. The development of the fifth column has an indefinitely longer range." (Secretary of War H. L. Stimson.)

It is imperative that every conscious American learn exactly how the forces work in the United States to drug this country against its own defense, while the German government completes the intermediate tasks leading to the direct assault upon the United States and the Western Hemisphere. At an earlier stage the Lindbergh lie about the "weakness" of the army and air force of the Soviet Union did tremendous service to Hitler, as we have pointed out. But after the beginning of the German attack on the Soviet Union and the revelation of the fighting capacity of the Red Army, the same reactionaries are using the argument that the "magnificent strength and courage" of the Soviet Army make it "unnecessary" for the United States to defend itself. This uncanny cleverness of Hitler's friends in America is shown by none better than the pro-Hitler, pro-Japanese, New York *Daily News:*

"A . . . reason America's military intervention in Europe would have less excuse now than ever is that Russia's trained and equipped millions are engaging the bulk of Nazi forces with 'magnificent strength and courage,' to quote the Churchill tribute." (July 30, 1941)

"Before Hitler tore into Russia on July 22 last, the danger (to the United States and Great Britain) might have been greater than Wheeler, Lindbergh & Co. said it was. . . .

"Now, however, Hitler is badly tangled up with the Red Army. . . . Which means that Hitler is in no position to try to invade England, let alone try to do anything drastic to the United States." (Aug. 9, 1941)

But the effects of Munich are not confined to the pro-Hitler press. The "indefinitely long range" of its influence is consciously and unconsciously allowed to determine the actions of many men and institutions dedicated to the destruction of Hitler.

The *New York Times,* which we credit with a sincere desire not to have Hitler conquer the world, nevertheless was so influenced by the old Munich habit of mind as to give the classic expression of a doctrine that, if followed, would accomplish for Hitler all that his fifth column attempts. The *Times* said ". . . that our primary interest is not in 'helping Russia' but in 'stopping Hitler.'" (*N. Y. Times,* Aug. 6, 1941.)

From this doctrine the *Times* reasoned that American military material should not be sent to the Soviet Russian Red Army.

Modern armies operate by burn-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing up and wearing out huge masses of factory products in an endless process of destruction. War is made by the stream of products from the giant modern factories to the giant modern machines at the front whose only effective operation is in expending those factory products in the greatest possible mass. Obviously the one most decisive of all immediate ways to help Hitler is to prevent the flow of that giant river of war material to the Red Army from the greatest source, the United States. Any whose desire to "stop Hitler" is limited by the wish not to "help Russia" will thereby help Hitler no matter what their desires may be.

This is what Clausewitz meant.

But *help* to other nations fighting Hitler, by means of manufactured products, tremendously important though it is, does not alone solve the problem of the national interest of the United States.

Here we insist upon the view of Earl Browder in regard to the national interest. If we were to conceive of our country's part as determined by "general humanitarian or pacifist considerations," it would be possible to dream of limiting America's role to "help" in the form of factory products sent to other nations fighting Hitler.

But the whole of the world-wide political struggle of this epoch has passed irrevocably into the stage of military solution. The defense of the national interest of the United States can be made effective only if, along with the utmost help of all powers fighting Hitler, it includes the building up and direct employment of the military and naval strength of the United States in this struggle for the defense of America. A danger to the very life of the nation came to light in the struggle over the bill for the continuation of the draft period of service. The issue in Congress was whether at the highest point of national crisis the half-completed army should be disbanded, which would set back our military preparations by nearly a year, and thereby, through helplessness, determining the foreign policy of the country. The influence of the appeasement forces, even where unconsciously accepted in some quarters was so great as to come within one vote in the House of disabling our country's foreign policy by dissolving its only means of defense.

The biggest mistake of judgment that could be made would be in thinking that the act of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill has once and for all settled the course of this country as a course of relentless all-out struggle against Hitler. On the contrary, the devotees of the cult of Munich and Cliveden and Vichy are more active, more virulent, more reckless and disregardful of the borderline of treason than ever before.

* * *

The official policy of our America has turned away from Munich, toward security for our country and the liberation of the world from the bloody beast of Nazism.

America, united, has to assure this course.

No one has a bigger stake in this than the workers.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FOR THE MILITARY DESTRUCTION OF HITLERISM!

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

Address delivered at the Stadium, Chicago, Aug. 20, 1941

THE American people, on pain of disaster, must fully realize that a Hitler victory over the Soviet Union and Great Britain would place in acute jeopardy the most fundamental national interests—the very national existence of the United States. They, therefore, should take all necessary steps, jointly with Great Britain, the U.S.S.R., China and other anti-fascist peoples, to repel the developing fascist world offensive and militarily to destroy Hitlerism, root and branch. This is the only means by which the United States can be effectively defended against the growing Hitler threat.

The history of Europe since the rise of Hitler shows beyond question that the U.S.S.R. has always been the great barrier holding back the flood of Nazi barbarism. It is modern civilization's main dike against Hitler's worse than medieval terrorism. This was true not only before the war, when the Soviet Union, with its support of Spain, China and Ethiopia, and its struggle for an international anti-fascist peace front, was the most solid obstacle to the growth of Hitler's power, but it has also been true ever since the war broke out two years ago.

In his brutal war to establish world hegemony for German imperialism Hitler had little difficulty in smashing the armies of rival capitalist states and in overrunning Europe. But he has not been able to expand on a world scale. This is because the Soviet Union has proved to be the insurmountable obstacle in the way of his larger plans of aggression. Hitler did not dare to invade England while the powerful Red Army remained intact at his rear. Nor did the fact that the U.S.S.R. was living up loyally to its non-aggression pact with Germany and wanted to remain at peace remove Hitler's deadly fear. The very existence of the mighty socialist state, the land of plenty and socialist democracy, constituted a threat to the spurious "New Order" which Hitlerism was proceeding to set up on the European continent in its drive for world enslavement. Also, when Hitler, with his plans to invade England blocked, sought another route out of Europe and on to world conquest, again it was the U.S.S.R. that halted

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him. This was during his great drive early this year down the Balkans and toward the Middle East, a campaign which aimed mainly at the capture of the Dardanelles and the Suez Canal, the conquest of Iran, Iraq, Egypt and other countries on the road to the Far East. The success of the drive would have meant a disaster for Great Britain and a great weakening of the position of the U.S.S.R. It was the Soviet Union which defeated this grandiose plan of Hitler's by stopping him dead at the Dardanelles.

Now Hitler is trying to destroy the Soviet Union, the great barrier to Nazi world conquest, the force which prevented his opening a doorway out of Europe through Great Britain at one end of the continent and through Turkey at the other. Hitler was doubly moved to attack the U.S.S.R., because of its rapidly increasing strength and its growing leadership of the conquered peoples. The fate of the world depends upon whether or not Hitler succeeds in destroying this loyal guardian of the gate, the U.S.S.R., and makes a path for himself to world conquest.

Were Hitler to achieve his aim of smashing the Soviet Union, then, with no Red Army to fear behind him, undoubtedly he could invade and crush Great Britain. Then, also, with gigantically increased economic, naval and air strength, he would soon be in a position for a decisive collision with the United States in a titanic struggle for world mastery.

From these facts it is clear that a victory for Hitler over the Soviet Union would put into gravest jeopardy the economic standards, civil liberties and national independence of the United States, as well as those of other countries. With the vast power he would then have at his command Hitler could not only conquer large areas of Latin America but also, with the help of the powerful pro-fascist elements in this country, he would threaten the very existence of the American republic.

The fight of the Soviet Union and Great Britain against Hitler is, therefore, also the fight of the American people, and we should give it all possible assistance and collaboration. The vast forces of the United States—food, munitions, funds, ships, men, everything necessary—should be thrown into the scale against Nazi Germany and its Japanese, Italian and other fascist allies. An international front of the peoples of the world, rallying around a firm alliance of Great Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States, can and should militarily destroy Hitlerism and wipe it from the face of the earth.

The Churchill-Roosevelt conference and the proposed three-power parley in Moscow are a good start in this general direction. But the decisions of aid there arrived at must be fully implemented by the most active collaboration between the three great powers. Especially have England and the United States the duty of building up a great western military front. Hitler must be crushed in a vast two-front vise. The people must be keenly alert to combat any tendency to leave the Red Army to bear the brunt of the fighting while the British content

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

themselves merely with bombing raids and the Americans only furnish munitions.

To mobilize the American people to perform their historic share in the world struggle against Nazi Germany there must be national unity; a national front of all those elements in the population who are willing to defend America by helping to crush Hitler. Hitler constitutes a threat to all the American people; therefore, the whole American nation should unite to smash him and his barbaric regime. The success of the national front against Hitler will basically depend upon the extent to which the workers, especially organized labor, give it solid support. The workers will shoulder their full share in the national effort to defeat Hitler; but they should at the same time insist that other classes likewise bear their just part of the burden. They will demand the maximum possible maintenance of their economic standards and civil rights and also the curbing of all excess profiteering and the efforts of reactionaries who try to exploit the war situation to set up their own brand of fascism in the United States.

The vast mass of the American people realize in large degree the menace to American national welfare caused by the aggressions of the Axis powers. That is why they so deeply hate Hitler and Japan and also why they favor aiding all those peoples who are fighting these powers. The bulk of the people not only endorse aid to the Soviet Union, but also, as the Gallup poll tells us, 54 per cent of them favor the use of convoys.

Nevertheless, the American people do not yet fully realize the tremendous sharpening of the danger to their national interests brought about by Hitler's invasion of the Soviet Union, and the consequent need for vigorous action to counteract it. They are still plagued by many hesitations and confusions. It is upon these weaknesses that the friends and dupes of Hitler operate. The appeasers and would-be Quislings and Pétains of this country; that is, the Hoovers, Lindberghs, Coughlins, Fords, Hearsts, Wheelers and Norman Thomases, who are also spokesmen and servitors of the most reactionary American financial interests—are busily at work trying to befuddle the masses, to break up their growing national unity, to sabotage every practical measure of defense, to disarm and demoralize the American people in the face of the deadly menace of Hitler Germany. Their main organizational center is the America First Committee. They are the fifth column in this country, the beginnings of the American fascist movement. The latest recruit to this sorry crew is none other than John L. Lewis, who, by signing the recent statement of the fifteen Republican appeasement leaders, served notice that he has abandoned the American people in this most critical moment of their history.

* * *

Let me review briefly some of the more insidious and virulent arguments used by the pro-Hitler elements to deceive the American people. First, there is the isolationist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fallacy in its baldest form, namely, that the United States is not concerned whether Hitler wins the war or not, but should hole-up in the Western Hemisphere and let the rest of the world go to smash if it will. Unfortunately, many people still believe in this political idiocy; hence the appeasers harp upon it ceaselessly. Obviously, however, the United States cannot, by sticking its head in the sand, avoid the great attack that will surely come against it from the vastly strengthened and more militant Nazi Germany should Hitler succeed in defeating the U.S.S.R. and Britain. Isolationism can only make that assault more certain and more devastating. By trying to drive a wedge between the United States and the present alliance of Great Britain and the U.S.S.R., isolationism dovetails into Hitler's plans of dividing his enemies and then destroying them one by one. Hitler's present main world strategy seeks to smash first the Soviet Union, then Great Britain, and finally the United States. To attempt to prevent the United States from actively helping the countries now fighting against Nazi Germany is, therefore, to serve consciously or unconsciously as an agent of Hitler. Isolationism, in the present war situation, has become national defeatism and surrender to Hitler. It is no mere coincidence that many isolationists, such as the *Chicago Tribune,* are openly preaching treason. What the protection of American national interests demands is not an impossible attempt to run away from the spreading menace of Hitlerism, but full cooperation with Great Britain and the Soviet Union in order militarily to destroy it.

Then there is the illusion that the American people can conserve their interests by taking the initiative in negotiating a general world peace with Hitler. This futile project, now being actively propagated by the America First Committee and other friends of German fascism, is the American phase of Hitler's current so-called peace drive. It is an attempt to harness the peace desires of the great masses to the Nazi war chariot. The American people should realize very clearly that there can be no peace with Hitlerite Germany. The only conceivable peace acceptable to Hitler would be a conqueror's peace; an appeasement peace that would demoralize the world forces of democracy and that would give Hitler much-needed time and resources to remobilize his forces for fresh aggressions. Hitler's brutal invasion of the peaceful Soviet Union is a final proof of the impossibility of any free nation living in peace with the Nazis. The whole history of Nazi Germany proves conclusively that the only road to world peace lies through the military destruction of Hitlerism. Hence, there should be no talk of peace with Hitler; nor should the people lose themselves in discussions over the precise terms upon which world peace will eventually be established when Hitler is smashed.

The big task before the masses of all countries, the one to which they should address their main attention, is to mobilize their combined military forces to destroy Hitler and his regime.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another dangerous illusion assiduously being sown among the masses by assorted fifth columnists and dupes of Hitlerite propaganda is to the effect that now that Germany and the Soviet Union are at war the American people have nothing further to worry about and can rest on their oars. "Let Bolshevism and Nazism destroy each other," say some of these reactionaries; while others put out the version that the Russians will do all the necessary fighting for us. Such propaganda is dangerous in the highest degree to the American people. It is akin to Chamberlain's ill-fated program of promoting a German-Soviet war; a reactionary scheme which resulted in giving almost all of Europe to Hitler. Failure or refusal of the United States and Great Britain to assume their full share of the burden, along with the U.S.S.R., in fighting Hitler would be a catastrophic mistake. Considering Nazi Germany's great strength, such a policy could lead to the defeat of the Soviet Union, with a sure aftermath of invasion for Britain and a desperate war of survival for the United States. Or, in case of a stalemate on the Eastern front, it might cause Hitler suddenly to turn his guns westward and destroy Britain, with ensuing disastrous world consequences. The smashing of Hitler is a tremendous task, one that will require the united strength of Great Britain, the United States, the Soviet Union and the oppressed peoples of Europe. Failure of the United States and Great Britain to cooperate fully with the U.S.S.R. now in its fight against Hitler could have even more devastating effects than did the refusal of these powers to support the pre-war proposal of the U.S.S.R. for an international peace front of the democratic peoples to restrain the fascist aggressor states; a refusal which brought about the rise of Hitler and the outbreak of the present war.

Then there are those who would give aid to Great Britain but none to the U.S.S.R. A typical example is the leader of the American Legion in New York State, who said recently that he would rather die fighting Hitler than help Stalin. But that is not the issue. The question is not that of helping Stalin but of helping America; for, as the conservative *New York Herald Tribune* of August 21 declared editorialy: "They [the Russians] hold today our first line of defense." Not to aid the U.S.S.R. is to aid Hitler against Britain and the U.S.S.R.—to aid Hitler against the U.S.A.

Hitler is making his main drive against the U.S.S.R., for reasons previously discussed. Therefore, everyone who wants to fight Hitler must give all possible aid, and immediately, to the U.S.S.R. To confine American assistance simply to Great Britain would be suicidal. Airplanes, guns, munitions of all sorts must also be rushed to the Eastern front. The Soviet Union should be provided with all necessary credits, priorities, and lend-lease arrangements to facilitate its most effective struggle. At the same time, Great Britain and the United States should cooperate in opening up a great Western front, so as to force Hitler into a fatal two-front war. The problem of destroying Hitler

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is a joint one for Great Britain, the United States and the U.S.S.R. Aid must be sent where it is most urgently needed, and this means that the U.S.S.R. must get its full share at once. Any tendency to play off one front against the other is a pro-Hitler tendency, and it could have the most disastrous effects.

* * *

There are others who, recognizing the menace of Hitlerism and desiring its destruction, say, "Let's help both Great Britain and the U.S.S.R.," and then they launch into a tirade to the effect that Stalin is as bad as or worse than Hitler. This is a favorite slant of the bourgeois press and the radio commentators. We also find the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. expressing the same idea. Do not such people realize that by this line they only add grist to the mill of the appeasers? For when people have constantly dinned into their ears the falsehood that the Soviet Union is cut from the same cloth as Nazi Germany, naturally their willingness to aid the U.S.S.R. is dampened. This is precisely what is wanted by Mr. Hitler and his American Quislings—the Hearsts, Lindberghs, Norman Thomases, etc. The lumping together of communism and fascism is an infamous lie, and it is especially the job of the Communists to prove it to be such. We must convince the masses that the U.S.S.R. is the strongest bastion of world freedom and also that in its socialist system is to be found the only final answer to the wars, hunger and fascism with which the rotting capitalist system is increasingly filling the earth. The American people, who are realizing more and more that the fate of world democracy is now hanging on the effectiveness of the Red Army, are also beginning to suspect the truth of the ocean of anti-Soviet slander with which they have been deluged for over twenty years. They are turning an honestly inquisitive ear toward the country that has produced such a splendid fighting force as that which is now heroically combating Hitler's plans for word conquest. The circulation of a couple of million more copies of the Dean of Canterbury's famous book, *The Soviet Power*, now being sold for five cents a copy, will go far toward giving them the information about the U.S.S.R. which they are so eagerly seeking.

Finally, there are those elements who are spreading the "all measures short of war" illusion. Many of these people (see the recent Auto Workers' convention, for example), honestly want to fight Hitler, but they unwisely try to set limits to the degree of the fight they will make against him, which is all very pleasing to the American agents and friends of Hitler. The advocates of the "all measures short of war" slogan overlook two very vital facts. First, they ignore the reality that Mr. Hitler, now out to conquer the world, also has a deciding vote as to whether or not the United States will enter the shooting stage of the war. Therefore, for any group in this country to say that it will use all methods against Hitler except war is to adopt an unrealistic attitude and to play into his hands.

Secondly, they ignore the fact

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that, although the United States is not yet fully a "shooting" belligerent, it is already deeply in the war. We may be perfectly sure that Mr. Hitler considers it to be war against Nazi Germany when this country gives huge quantities of planes, ships, guns and food to Great Britain, when it promises to help the U.S.S.R., when it occupies Greenland and Iceland; when it holds what are virtually war conferences with the representatives of Great Britain, the U.S.S.R. and China; and when it takes one drastic step after another to checkmate Hitler's aggressions. We may also be certain that when Hitler deems the time ripe he will reply to such measures by waging open warfare against us. Daily Hitler's offensive against this country takes on sharper forms. Already his Axis partner, Japan, has advanced to the very brink of war with us. Those who would defend the interests of the American people in this world, when the Nazi tiger is on the loose, must not handcuff the country with the slogan "all measures short of war." The true watchword for our people in these critical days is "every measure necessary for the military destruction of Hitler!"

For the successful building of national unity against Hitler it is necessary to liquidate isolationism, the illusion that a negotiated peace with Hitler is possible, the deadly notion that the Red Army alone can do all the fighting against Nazi Germany, the proposition of aiding Britain but not the Soviet Union, of favoring aid to the U.S.S.R., but of denouncing it in the same breath, the "all measures short of war" delusion, and similar pro-Hitler ideas and propaganda. The master weapon to combat this type of fifth column propaganda effectively is to make clear to the American people how the whole character of the war has been changed by the involvement of the U.S.S.R. What before was an imperialist war has now become a war for the freedom and independence of all nations and peoples. By his attack on the U.S.S.R. Hitler is trying to demolish the main fortress of world democracy, thereby enormously jeopardizing the liberty and well-being of all peoples, including those of the United States. Moreover, with the U.S.S.R. now in the war, there exists the prospect of a decisive victory over Hitlerism and a guarantee of a genuinely democratic peace. Once the American people understand more definitely the changed character of the war and the vital significance that it now holds for them, the sooner they will overcome their lingering confusion and hesitation. They will then be prepared to adopt every means necessary for the destruction of Hitler.

* * *

In his attack upon the Soviet Union Hitler has made two major miscalculations. Properly utilized by the democratic peoples, these basic errors can be made to bring about his downfall. The first of Hitler's mistakes in his campaign against the U.S.S.R. was to underestimate grossly the fighting capacity of the Red Army and the Soviet people. He and his generals, like many so-called experts in other

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capitalist countries, thought the Soviet Union would be a pushover for the German army; that the war would be a matter of only a few weeks at most. Instead, Hitler has run into a resolute and powerful resistance. He is shattering the élite of his fascist forces and destroying the best of his war material upon the granite of Soviet resistance. Meanwhile, behind him the peoples of the occupied countries, taking heart from the Red Army's valiant fight, are beginning to stir in the revolt that will eventually grow into a major factor in the wiping out of Hitlerism. The Moscow correspondent of the Chicago *Daily News*, reflecting present world military opinion, declared in the issue of August 18 that the Soviet-German war was going to be a long, hard one, saying "Adolph Hitler terribly miscalculated Soviet morale."

It is our task, that of the Communist Party as well as of the rest of the American people, to help make Hitler's miscalculations of Soviet strength fatal to him, by sending limitless quantities of munitions to the U.S.S.R. and by demanding that the United States and Great Britain create a great Western front, one that will catch Nazi Germany in the death trap of a two-front war.

Hitler's second major miscalculation in his anti-Soviet war was his underestimation of the world hatred of Nazism. He thought that all he had to do was to proclaim a holy crusade against Bolshevism, whereupon the peoples of Great Britain and the United States, as well as those of lesser countries, would either join hands with him against the U.S.S.R. or, at least, would give Germany a free hand to assail the world's first socialist state. But the peoples of this and other countries have come to learn the treachery, brutality and barbarism of the Nazi regime. Moreover, they cannot be caught with the bait of anti-Sovietism. Hence, instead of joining up with Hitler in his so-called anti-Bolshevik crusade, they are rapidly building a powerful international front to destroy him.

It is also our task to help make this second great error of Hitler's a potent cause in his undoing. The American people should insist that their government join in full collaboration with the U.S.S.R. and Great Britain; that it aid and stimulate the resistance of China and all other peoples fighting against fascism; that it take all necessary steps, jointly with the growing international front, to wipe the pest of Hitlerism from the face of the earth. The only way to defend America effectively is by collaborating with all other anti-Nazi peoples, immediately and with all our power, militarily to annihilate Hitler and to smash his whole monstrous murder machine.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WITH ALL POSSIBLE CLARITY

BY JOSE DIAZ

Foreword by Robert Minor

THE document we republish here in translation* is a letter sent by José Diaz, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Spain, on behalf of the Political Bureau of that Party, to the editors of the Party's newspaper, *Mundo Obrero*, at Madrid, in order to correct a serious political error that paper had made.

It was an error of confusion as to the nature of the war in which Spain was engaged. The Popular Front of Spain included various classes and different political parties, and two trade union federations of conflicting general views, all of which were united for the single common purpose of defending the republican and democratic regime from the fascist attack. The *Mundo Obrero* momentarily lost sight of the character of the war, and of the nature of the People's Front that was indispensable to the successful conduct of the struggle. By improvising its own speculative ideas as to the objectives of the war, the *Mundo Obrero* tended very dangerously to narrow down the basis of the common struggle at the very moment when it was most necessary to broaden that basis.

This historic document is republished because of its clarifying effect upon our present-day problems. No ready-made formula derived from a past experience can ever serve as a substitute for a concrete study of problems of the present. The situation today is not identical with that of Spain in March, 1938, where a democratic revolution had recently overthrown both a monarchy and one military fascist dictatorship, and had left a residue of class relationships obviously dissimilar to those we have to deal with. The united national front which we demand today in America for its defense against the Nazi aggression is not identical with the Popular Front of Spain. But we have a lesson to learn about our present problems in studying this historic Spanish document. Our problems have some basic characteristics in common with theirs. The issue today, as in Spain in 1938, is not a socialist revolution, but a united defense of our country and its democracy against German fascist enslavement. Today, also, to *at least* the same degree, any confusion as to the character of the war, any errors that tend to narrow down the broad basis of mass support of the defense of the country —expressing the unity of the nation —may bring irreparable harm.

The spirit in which the Spanish Communist Party faced its problems is one we can emulate.

* Originally published in the *Frente Rojo* ("Red Front") of March 30, 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TO THE Editors of *Mundo Obrero:*

Dear Comrades: In the *Mundo Obrero,* issue of March 23, there appears an article which it is necessary emphatically to call to your attention and that of the Party as a whole. The article begins by saying that "everything which tends to confuse the masses should be clarified with the utmost care." The correctness of this statement no one can deny; and it is precisely for this reason that I deem it necessary to address this letter to you, after reading your article and coming upon such a statement as the following:

". . . We cannot say, as one newspaper does, that the only satisfactory outcome of the war in which we are engaged is that Spain should end by being neither fascist nor Communist, merely because France would have it so."

I do not know what newspaper it is that is the object of your polemic. It is possible that the paper in question is edited by persons hostile to our Party, who do not understand very well the problems of this war; but the statement that "the only satisfactory outcome of the war in which we are engaged is that Spain should end by being neither fascist nor Communist" is absolutely correct and exactly corresponds to the position of our Party.

It is necessary to repeat, in order that there may not be the least lingering doubt on the subject: the *Spanish people in this war are fighting for their national independence and for the defense of the democratic republic.* They are fighting in order to hurl back from the soil of our country the barbarous German and Italian invaders. They are fighting because they do not wish to see Spain transformed into a fascist colony. They are fighting because they do not want Spain to be fascist. They are fighting for liberty, in defense of the democratic and republican regime, which is the legal government of our country, and which is the one that affords the broadest opportunities for social progress.

The Communist Party, which is, along with the Socialist, the party of the working class of Spain, has not and cannot have any interests and objectives other than those of the people as a whole. Our Party has never thought that the outcome of this war would be the setting up of a Communist regime. If the working masses, the peasants and the urban petty bourgeoisie follow us and like us, it is because they know that we are the staunchest defenders of national independence, freedom and the republican Constitution. Such a defense is the basis, the very content, of our entire policy of unity and the Popular Front. And it would be a very serious thing, one we cannot permit to happen, if within the ranks of our Party there should develop—I shall not say any vacillation but, rather, the slightest lack of clarity on this question, particularly at the present moment, when a maximum unity of the people is needed to meet the furious onslaught of the foreign invaders. In our country today there exist certain objective conditions which render imperative, in the interest of all the people, the con-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tinuance and strengthening of a democratic regime; the conditions do not exist which would permit us to think of setting up a Communist regime.

To raise the question of setting up a Communist regime would mean to divide the people; for a Communist regime would not be acceptable to all Spaniards, nor anything like it, and our Party will never do anything to divide the people, but rather, since the beginning of the war, has struggled with all the forces at its disposal to unite them, to unite all Spaniards in the fight for freedom and national independence. I will go further. I will say that, at a moment like the present, when our task is to mobilize the people to the last man for a supreme resistance, by way of meeting the invaders' offensive, a resistance which is the necessary condition for our own counter-offensive and ultimate victory—at such a moment, if we were to think of any change in our Party's tactics, it ought to be not with the object of restricting the basis of popular unity, but rather with the object of broadening that base. This unity should take in important layers of the population which, in the Rebel zone, are under the yoke and, it may be, under the influence of fascist propaganda; it should take in all Spaniards who do not want to be the slaves of a barbarous foreign dictatorship.

This is the first point which it was necessary to clear up; and from the manner in which we raise the question, all the Party organizations should draw their own conclusions, in so far as our policy of unity and our relations with the Republican, Socialist, and other popular anti-fascist forces are concerned.

There is another point in your article which it is necessary to clarify, namely, the one which has to do with the relation of the democratic countries of Europe and America to the Spanish people and their struggle. You assert that "the Spanish people will conquer against the opposition of capitalism." Such an assertion might be interpreted as a declaration of faith in the inexhaustible energy of our people; but, politically, it also does not correspond either to the present situation or to the policy of our Party and that of the Communist International. In my report to the November plenum of our Central Committee, I said:

"There is a ground upon which all democratic states can meet for joint action. It is the ground of defending their own existence against the aggressor who confronts all: fascism; it is the ground of self-defense against the war which threatens all."

In speaking of "all the democratic states," we were not thinking of the Soviet Union alone, where a socialist democracy exists, but we were thinking as well of France, England, Czechoslovakia, the United States, etc., which are democratic countries, but capitalistic ones. We want those states to aid us; we feel that, in aiding us, they are defending their own interests; we endeavor to make them understand this, and solicit their aid.

The position that you adopt in your article is a very different and an incorrect one. The mistake lies

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in forgetting the international character of our struggle, which is a struggle against fascism, that is to say, against the most reactionary sector of capitalism, the provokers of a new and terrible world war, the enemies of peace and of the freedom of peoples.

We know that the fascist aggressors in every country will find support in certain bourgeois groups, such as the British Conservatives and the Rightists in France; but fascist aggression develops in such a manner that, in a country like France, for example, national interest alone should suffice to convince all freedom-loving men, and those who care for the independence of their country, of the necessity of opposing such aggression. And there does not exist today any more efficacious means of opposing it than by lending concrete aid to the people of Spain. Every self-respecting Frenchman can and should be made to understand that, in Spain, it is France's independence also that is being fought for, and that for all we know, the fate of France may be decided on the fields of Aragon.

The manner in which you raise the question would inevitably lead to our limiting once more the scope of our struggle, at the very moment when it is imperative to broaden it. The task of organizing international aid for Spain in this tragic instant of world history is incumbent principally upon the international working class and its organizations; but any means which may be taken to convince other non-working-class forces, of the petty bourgeoisie and the democratic and liberal bourgeoisie, of the necessity of such aid, cannot but meet with our approval.

How is it that the *Mundo Obrero* came to adopt a false position on questions of such importance? It may be the result of a mistaken interpretation of the correct position adopted by our Party these last few weeks, in mobilizing all its forces to denounce and exterminate by the root any lurking intent of capitulation or compromise, while at the same time demanding an energetic policy for carrying on the war, one in keeping with the gravity of the situation. This struggle should continue, and shall continue. But this position of our Party does not mean, and could not in any way mean, any change of attitude on our part, with respect to our appraisal of the character of our revolution, or our estimate of the international situation and our own policy of unity. On the contrary, everything that we seek is in the interest of the people and of the prosecution of the war. On this point, all anti-fascists can and should agree with us; or better yet: all Spaniards who want to see this war end with the victory of our fatherland and the defeat of the fascist invaders. The Party's task, based upon this premise, consists in drawing closer the bonds of unity among all the anti-fascist sectors. Today more than ever: nothing that interferes with unity, and everything that may achieve the broadest and firmest unity of the people that is possible.

For this reason, my dear editorial friends of *Mundo Obrero*, we must avoid raising in a false or confused manner questions which long since should have been clear to all of us.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEGRO PEOPLE AND THE FIGHT FOR JOBS

BY THEODORE R. BASSETT

THE demand for jobs emerged as a major issue among the Negro people in 1933. Taking shape against the background of the general crisis of capitalism, this demand was an outgrowth of the profound economic crisis of 1929-33, which wrought great havoc among the Negro masses. With the outbreak of the war in 1939, the already intolerable economic conditions of the Negro masses became aggravated. War production rapidly expanded and was becoming dominant in our national economy. But the big monopolies, holding the lion's share of the government contracts for airplanes, guns, tanks, artillery and other war materials, established a nationwide boycott against Negro labor. Discrimination was rampant in the vocational program. At the same time, work relief was drastically curtailed, the Southern agrarian economy suffered further dislocations. This situation confronted the Negro people with a grave and unprecedented crisis in their economic life.

The Negro Masses Demand Jobs and Equality

An upsurge developed among the Negro people affecting millions. The Negro masses had fought determinedly for the passage of the anti-lynching and anti-poll tax legislation and for jobs in the public utilities and private industry in general. The mass movement of the Negro people around these issues now merged with the struggle for jobs in the defense industries and for equality in vocational training which now became the main demands of the Negro people. The growing indignation of the Negroes found vent in numerous ways.

James W. Ford, Communist Vice-Presidential candidate in the 1940 campaign, boldly proclaimed that the treatment of the Negro people was the test of any democratic program for the welfare of the entire nation and evoked a warm response from broad strata of the Negro people. This response, which was indicated in the growing upsurge of the Negro masses, had a great influence upon the mass movement of the Negro people.

New organizations and committees came into being around this demand for jobs and against discrimination in the defense program. A number of national conferences were held. On November 17 a convention held in Washington formed the National Negro Council; on November 25 and 26 the Hampton Conference was held at Hampton

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Institute, Hampton, Virginia; on November 29 the *Pittsburgh Courier* Conference was held under the auspices of the Committee for the Participation of Negroes in National Defense, in Washington; and on March 27 and 28, 1941, a conference of Negro national organizations under the auspices of the Chicago councils of national organizations was held, also in Washington. The National Negro Congress held a number of local conferences, outstanding among which was the Baltimore April 27 conference for jobs for Negroes at the Glenn L. Martin Co. On May 27, 160 Negro leaders issued a ringing call for jobs and equality. A pronounced trend developed toward mass unity on a national scale.

Big local struggles for jobs were taking place throughout the country. Labor during this period engaged in mighty struggles, scored historic victories, beat back the wage-cutting offensive of the bourgeoisie, and organized new millions of workers. Outstanding achievements were the organization of that powerful citadel of the open shop, the Ford plant, and the partial breakdown of the southern wage differential in coal. The militancy of the Negro proletariat stood out in these struggles.

In this situation of the rising Negro mass movement, with its growing unity and its trend toward cooperation wih labor, A. Phillip Randolph put forward the idea for a "March on Washington" for jobs and for equality in the armed forces. Active organization for the march began in the Spring. Among those associated with Randolph in sponsoring the march were Dr. Channing H. Tobias, of the Advisory Committee for Selective Service; Lester B. Granger, Assistant Executive Secretary, National Urban League; Walter White, Executive Secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and Henry K. Craft, Executive Secretary, Y.M.C.A. of Harlem. "March on Washington" Committees were set up on a national scale. Unfortunately, however, the march was organized in a narrow, nationalist spirit, excluding the participation of any white organizations, even those of organized labor. It should be noted also that a pronounced anti-Communist atmosphere was set up around the organization of the march. Nevertheless, the great mass movement of the Negro people gathered around it. The National Negro Congress, the Southern Youth Congress, and progressives among labor and the people supported it. The Communist Party supported the march and actively participated in the organization of the masses for it. The object of the Communists was to transform the march from a narrow, separatist movement around the single issue of jobs and equality in the armed forces, into a united movement of all forces among the Negro people, buttressed by labor, and linking up the main demand of the march with other burning and fundamental issues before the Negro masses.

Bolstered by the participation of the Left and progressive forces among labor and the people, the movement broke through the narrow framework designed for the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

march by Randolph and his fellow-initiators, and compelled President Roosevelt to issue the Executive Order calling for the abolition of Negro job discrimination in the defense industries and in the vocational training program.

Note should be taken, however, of such shortcomings of the Order as failure to provide penalties for violations, failure to apply retroactively to $16,000,000,000 of existing contracts, and failure to apply specifically against discrimination in Federal agencies in general, particularly in the Army and Navy.

The Order authorized the establishment of a Committee of Fair Employment Practices, to be appointed by the President. The six-man committee consists of David Sarnoff, President of the Radio Corporation of America; Earl B. Dickerson, Chicago Alderman; Mark F. Ethridge, Chairman of the committee, Vice-President and general manager of the *Louisville Courier-Journal;* Philip Murray, President of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; Milton P. Webster, Vice-President of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; and William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor. Of these, two—Dickerson and Webster—are Negro.

Despite its shortcomings, the Order constituted without doubt an important victory, not only for the Negro people, but for the whole labor movement and all progressives. The canceling of the march by the initiators after the issuance of the Presidential Order was strongly and justifiably resented by broad sections of the masses.

Negro Job Discrimination and the Fight Against Hitlerism

The President's Order was issued three days after the brutal assault of Hitler fascism on the Soviet Union. Hence the struggle for its enforcement and implementation goes on in the new situation of the changed character of the war, bringing new aspects of the problem to the fore. This change in the character of the war, however, in no wise lessens the importance of this struggle. On the contrary, it brings forward the question more sharply for solution now as a *central issue* of the national front for the defeat of Hitlerism.

Our national defense against the Nazi menace demands an enormous increase in the production of war material, of airplanes, guns and tanks. Immediate aid must be given to the U.S.S.R., Britain and all nations battling against Hitlerism, through the full implementation of the declared policy of the Roosevelt Administration. The 15,000,000 Negro people of the U.S.A. bear a deep and implacable hatred of fascism. Their indignation rose to great heights during the barbaric and unprovoked assault of Italian fascism on the Ethiopian people. The Negroes want to annihilate Hitler and Hitlerism. Manpower in production is now a life and death question. Yet millions of powerful black hands, eager to produce for the national defense, for the defeat of Hitlerism, are chained by the Hitler-like boycott against Negro labor.

The fight for jobs for Negroes is a struggle to use the productive power of the nation; to employ the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

full resources of our country, the mills, the mines and factories, to make the United States in truth a mighty arsenal of democracy in order to guarantee the extermination of fascism.

Our national defense against Hitler-fascism demands guarding and constantly improving the standards of the people, preserving and broadening the democratic liberties of the people. A hungry, shackled and disunited people cannot defend America. The June 28-29 Manifesto of the National Committee of the Communist Party* states:

"The true defense of the American people against its enemies at home and abroad demands a conscientious policy of steady improvement of the economic standards, the health and the general well-being of the masses. It demands that the democratic liberties of the people be guarded, preserved and extended. These are basic requisites for a successful struggle to defeat German fascism."

The Bourbon survivals expressed in the oppression of the Negro people lie in the very center of the path of struggle to maintain and extend the people's well-being and democratic liberties and to attain full national unification.

The fight for jobs for Negroes is not only a struggle for the right of the Negro masses to live; it is a struggle for bettering the living conditions and for broadening the democracy of all the people, for unleashing the powerful anti-fascist energy of the Negro masses—an important force in the anti-Hitler front. It is a struggle against Hitlerite practice and ideology in the U.S.A., a struggle against the appeasers of Hitler, against the reactionary monopolists who place their narrow, selfish interests above the welfare of the nation.

It is not at all strange, therefore, that the appeasers of Hitler, the camp of Lindbergh, Hearst, Coughlin and "Grass Roots" Talmadge strive to utilize the national oppression of the Negroes as a weapon against the further broadening of our democracy around the program for the defeat of Hitlerism. It is not at all strange that they seek to incite the whites against the Negroes; try to resurrect (of course, with new content today, *i. e.*, fascist content) the old flags and battle cries of Reconstruction: "Negro domination," "White supremacy," etc.

These are not aimless gyrations; they are political shafts directed at what reaction considers the weakest sector of the anti-Hitler front.

But this is only one side of the picture; if, on the one hand, reaction and fascism endeavor to utilize the national oppression of the Negroes as a weapon against the advance of the people's fight against fascism, on the other hand, history, which demands the speedy solution of this historical anachronism, this relic of slavery, *has placed squarely into the hands of the working class and the anti-Hitler movement a hard-striking weapon directed at one of the most vulnerable spots of the reactionary pro-Hitler front.*

Moreover, the struggle for jobs for Negroes and for economic equality is an important phase of the na-

* Published in *The Communist* for August.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional liberation struggle of the Negro people. Every advance made toward Negro economic equality in industry accelerates the break-up of the semi-serf agrarian relations in the Black Belt. These pre-capitalist survivals constitute the economic structure, the material foundation upon which rests the economic, social and political proscription of the 15,000,000 Negro people.

The break-up of Negro economic inequality greatly undermines the economic basis of opportunism in the labor movement, it robs the bourgeoisie of an important source of superprofits with which it supports the labor aristocracy. The bourgeoisie is thus deprived of one of its chief weapons for splitting and retarding the working class movement.

Finally, the fight for jobs for Negroes is a fight against the declassing of the Negro proletariat. This is a question of paramount importance because the Negro working class is destined to play an important role both as an integral part of the working class and as leader of the national liberation movement. The break-up of economic inequality paves the way for the numerical growth of the Negro working class and a deepening of its political consciousness.

Unity, Key Question of the Negro Liberation Movement Today

The mass movement of the Negro people has already punctured the airtight boycott of the monopolies. Even though some of the most notorious firms have not yet been crashed, reports from the country over indicate that a beginning is being made.

On April 19 the Negro masses in Harlem, under the leadership of the United Bus Association and supported by the Transport Workers' Union, forced the Fifth Avenue Coach Company and the New York City Omnibus Company to hire Negroes. The agreement called for a minimum of 100 Negro bus drivers and 70 maintenance men before any new white workers would be hired, following which Negro and white were to be hired on an equal basis until the Negroes constituted 17 per cent of the total employees. Three organizations combined to form the association—the National Negro Congress, the Greater New York Coordinating Committee for Employment and the Harlem Labor Union. The National Negro Congress, conducting a campaign for 7,000 jobs for Negroes at the Glenn L. Martin Company, recently reported "satisfactory conversations." Weeks before that, on June 20, the Congress reported 200 Negroes had been hired by Martin's. Other firms altering their employment policy, according to the National Urban League, are Sperry Gyroscope of Brooklyn and Brewster Aeronautical Corporation of Long Island City. The National Bronze and Aluminum Company of Cleveland is hiring 500 Negro workers. Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator, reports a 47 per cent increase in the placement of Negro workers through state employment offices during the first five months of 1941 over the previous year.

These concessions illustrate the power of the Negro people's move-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment, strengthened and supported by labor. The Negro masses have taken their place in the front ranks of the forces fighting against Hitlerism. Closer collaboration of activity between the basic organizations of the Negro people, and an increased consciousness and activity on the part of labor in connection with the demand of the Negro people for jobs can add to the nation's productive power hundreds of thousands of Negro workers to speed up the production of defense material.

Unity of all the Negro forces, from the top and from below, in the communities, and supported by labor, for the enforcement of the President's Executive Order in local plants, is of paramount importance to the Negro movement and the fight against Hitlerism. The achievement of unity is the central issue before the Negro movement. This means unity of the whole Negro people, all strata without exception, sharecroppers, workers, professional and business men.

With the changed situation and the developing national front against Hitlerism, unprecedented possibilities exist for the realization of a broad national front of the Negro masses.

Unity is further facilitated by the growth of labor's influence among the Negro middle class organizations, as evidenced at the recent national conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People at Houston, Texas. The recent national convention of the Ethiopian World Federation is an excellent illustration of the possibilities of uniting the Negro people around a program of action for the defeat of Hitlerism. This organization, which arose as a narrow, nationalist organization, welcomed the collaboration of labor and progressive forces; adopted a program of aid to the U.S.S.R., Britain, Ethiopia and all peoples battling Hitlerism; demanded equality in industry and in the armed forces, and the passage of the Anti-Lynching and Anti-Poll Tax Bills.

There is today no basic difference between the varied influential Negro mass organizations which should prevent them from broad cooperative action around the issue of job-marching on local plants. The organizational forms of the local united committees can be of the most varied character. In some instances a March-to-Washington Committee may be the center around which unity may be established; in others, locals of the National Committee for Participation in National Defense; in still others, the National Negro Congress, N.A.A.C.P. branches, local Urban Leagues, or locals of the Ethiopian World Federation. The main question is swift unity of action.

The opportunities for unity of the Negro masses are great; but it will not be realized automatically. Unity will be achieved only through struggle, through overcoming the obstacles that stand in its way.

Sectarianism is a particularly pernicious and tenacious obstacle to Negro unity, and it must be resolutely combated. Sectarian tendencies have been expressed in a hesitancy to approach all strata and all organizations of the Negro

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

masses for united activity, particularly those circles and individuals that in the previous period adhered to a policy which hindered unity. In other cases non-Party forces, mainly proletarian, sincerely desiring to effect united action, have hesitated to take the initiative to approach Negro bourgeois and professional elements. Initiative and boldness in organizing united action of the Negro people by the Communists and all Negro anti-fascists are the urgent need of the hour

Certain tendencies toward ignoring the danger of the activity of the appeasement forces among the Negro masses have appeared recently. One cannot dismiss this danger lightly, for it would be a serious mistake to do so. What is necessary is a thorough examination of the special forms which the activities of these elements and their arguments take among the Negro people. For precisely on account of the advances, the high level of development and the potentialities of the anti-Hitlerism movement among the Negro masses, the reactionary pro-Hitlerite bourgeoisie is striving and undoubtedly will increase its efforts to disrupt the growing unity of the Negro people. The pro-Hitler America First Committee is making a bid for Negro support. They have taken steps nationally to organize the Negro masses. Through Perry Howard, Republican National Committeeman from Mississippi, they have recently circularized large numbers of Negro people with their literature. Norman Thomas is actively engaged in trying to peddle the bil of goods of the appeasers among the Negro masses. The arguments of the appeasers have already appeared here and there in the Negro press. George Schuyler, columnist of the *Pittsburgh Courier,* Negro weekly, and Frank Crosswaith, Negro Social-Democrat, have been particularly vocal in this respect.

Trotskyism, too, is striving to penetrate the nationalist groupings, with the aim of preventing the broad masses in these organizations from following the path toward unity with the anti-Hitler forces, toward which they are moving. Thus, a bestial perversion of nationalism parading under the name of the "National Organization of Negro Youth" has appeared. This clique of reactionaries are supporters of Japanese imperialism and Hitler's "New Order."

The struggle for unity demands the merciless exposure and isolation of these elements.

Lessons of the Fight

What is the great lesson of the historical experiences of the past few months for the Negro masses? For labor? *Victory in the fight for jobs for Negroes, a fight against entrenched monopoly, is possibly only in unity with the working class. Support of the Negro community is a powerful weapon in the hands of labor in the struggle against monopoly.* The Communists have struggled for years to realize this idea. That is why the Negro masses immediately appreciated the role of the Communists in the successful struggle for jobs for Negroes on the New York bus lines. They knew that the Communists were a factor in helping to unite the Negro peo-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ple, that they had helped build the Transport Workers Union, and that they had consistently fought for solidarity between the white and Negro workers. They saw that Red-baiting was a weapon of the Negro-hating utility magnates designed to weaken their forces.

Could greater gains have been scored by the Negro people and labor during that period? Undoubtedly so, considering the deep indignation of the Negro masses, their determination to struggle, their understanding of the issues involved, their willingness to unite with labor and all progressive forces, including the Communists. Greater gains could have been attained by proper guidance. Greater gains could undoubtedly have been scored had progressive labor more clearly seen the issue involved in the fight.

What then was the barrier to this guidance? What was lacking?

The advanced forces among the Negro people did not as a whole fully appreciate the temper of the Negro masses, nor the need for flexibility in directing into proper channels the anger of the Negro masses, which was overflowing the channels of existing stable organization and giving rise to varied organizations and committees. They did not fully appreciate the trends toward unity among the masses or the need and possibility of unification around a suitable program of action.

The Basis of Job Discrimination

Whence springs the discriminatory policy? Why is the joblessness of the Negro people a special problem? Can it be because the employers do not like the color of the Negroes, as some Negro leaders assert? Or is it, perhaps, because discriminating employers are just "malicious" persons? No, the most superficial examination of the question reveals that this is not the case. Tobacco manufacturers, for example, employ Negroes in a wholesale fashion, whereas cotton manufacturers rigidly exclude them from the machines. Both industries are located in the South; both are controlled by Wall Street capital. It cannot be said that the tobacco manufacturers are "good" men who don't mind the Negro's color, while the cotton manufacturers are just the opposite. Nor by any stretch of the imagination can it be said that the employers "like" the white workers; for not a single gain has been won by them from the capitalists except by bitter struggle. Moreover, to ascribe the discrimination against Negroes to the simple factor of race or to the "badness" of individual employers weakens the fight for Negro economic equality, because it divorces the problem from its social and economic roots and blurs the real basis of the *deliberate policy* of the ruling monopoly bourgeoisie expressed in its nationwide boycott of Negro labor. To describe Negro job discrimination and joblessness as the result of a "race question" also plays into the hands of the reactionary chauvinist theories of Hitler and his "scientists," who make race the alpha and omega of social development.

Can it be the racial expression of a class question, as the Social-Democrats are wont to assert? No, that is the trail of the petty-bour-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

geois "human nature" formula which divorces the problem from its fundamental social and economic roots.

Negro job discrimination and joblessness cannot be reduced to a racial question or racial expression of a class question.

The racial features of the Negroes facilitate the discriminatory treatment meted out to them. The problem arises out of class exploitation. But these factors cannot explain the special form of the question among the Negroes. The essence of the question lies in *national oppression,* in the fact that it is a definite phase of the economic retardation of the Negroes as an *oppressed nation.*

Negro job discrimination is a deliberate policy of the bourgeoisie. Negro unemployment, as an aggravated phase of the general problem of unemployment growing out of the general crisis of capitalism in the United Sates, is an expression of the national oppression of the Negro people.

The maintenance of an economic differential between black and white workers is designed to furnish an economic basis for winning the support of the latter to the American capitalist policy of Negro national oppression. And here it must be admitted that Wall Street has achieved a measure of success. The American labor aristocracy is the bearer of this boss policy of racial prejudice against Negro workers. They, a small minority of the workers, are fed extra crumbs from the table of the bourgeoisie which come in part from the oppressed Negro people, while the great masses of the white workers receive lower wages, and the Negroes the lowest of all. The last quarter of the nineteenth century, the period of the transformation of American industrial capitalism into imperialism, the period of the rise of the labor aristocracy and the establishment of its dominant position in the labor movement, was coincident with the period of the betrayal of the Negroes by the Northern bourgeoisie and their violent extra-legal and "constitutional" semi-reinslavement by their former slavemasters. The policy of the "labor aristocrats" toward Negroes is part and parcel of their general failure to defend labor's economic interests and rights. One must make a clear distinction between such a policy alien to the working class and the real proletarian policy based on solidarity of all workers, on struggle for a true people's program, for national unity in the struggle against Hitlerism, for defending labor's economic interests and rights, of which the fight for equality in employment for Negroes is an important aspect.

Certain Negro leaders pine for the "goodness" of the capitalists of 1917 who hired Negroes en masse and lament the "wickedness" of the monopolists of today who boycott Negro labor. But the "goodness" and "wickedness" in general of employers, the "goodness" of 1917 and the "wickedness" of 1941, are nothing more than the reflection of different aspects of a single unchanging policy of maintaining economic division between the black and white workers, of preserving the economic base of Negro national oppression.

In 1915-17 American industry as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a whole was undergoing unprecedented and rapid expansion. The factories were humming with war orders for the Allied powers. At the same time immigration had been cut off by the war and there was a shortage of labor. The "divide and rule" policy of monopoly capital then demanded the bringing of hundreds of thousands of Negroes to the North with the object of assuring a supply of "cheap" and "docile" labor. Importing Negroes from the South with their peasant outlook and lack of experiences in labor struggles aimed at pitting "backward" and "revengeful" Negro labor against struggling white labor. Today, in 1941, even with the war stimulus in effect for nearly two years, American economy has only partly recovered from prolonged stagnation, and there are many millions of unemployed. Moreover, a factor of singular importance is the tremendous growth of the Negro proletariat in organization and in maturity and its establishment of closer ties with progressive labor. Today, the policy of fostering division in the ranks of the workers demands exclusion of Negro workers from industry. It is this cold impersonal class motivation which has given rise to the policy of boycotting Negro labor, and the existence of aggravated unemployment as a special problem among the Negro people.

The Negro People Look to the Lesson of the U.S.S.R.

Alleviation of this evil of joblessness which besets the Negro people with such ferocity can now come about through curbing monopoly capital. It can, however, be finally extirpated only with the socialist reorganization of society. The Soviet Union, which has incorporated in its constitution the guarantee of the right to work to all, is eloquent testimony of this fundamental solution of the unemployment problem. Article 118 of the Stalinist constitution states:

"Citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the right to work, that is, are guaranteed the right to employment and payment for their work in accordance with its quantity and quality.

"The right to work is ensured by the socialist organization of the national economy, the steady growth of the productive forces of Soviet society, the elimination of the possibility of economic crises, and the abolition of unemployment."

The Negro people recognize discrimination in employment and training in the defense industry as a barbarous, Hitleristic practice. They are attracted to the Soviet Union because it has eradicated national and racial oppression. What under tsarism was a hotbed of national and racial hatreds is now under the Soviet Union a brotherhood of free and equal nations and peoples. Moreover, the Soviet Union has shown the way to solve fundamentally the unemployment problem, this peculiarly distressing feature of the national oppression of the American Negroes.

This sentiment of the Negro people is admirably expressed by Dr. W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, eminent Negro scholar, who states:

"Russia more than any other country in the world is making a frontal attack on the problem of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poverty; and I believe that the problem of poverty is the basic problem of our day; conditioning all other problems of race, politics, industry and creative art." (N. Y. *Amsterdam News,* Feb. 24, 1940.)

And more recently, since the brutal assault of Hitler fascism on the U.S.S.R.:

"The hopes of the modern world rest on the survival of the new conception of politics and industry which Russia represents." (N. Y. *Amsterdam-Star News,* July 26, 1941.)

The Negro people know that the Soviet Union has made "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" a living reality for all the Soviet peoples, a fact which bespeaks the fundamental democratic character of Soviet society. The appeasers, the Lindbergh-Hoover-Hearst-Norman Thomas camp, demagogically lump communism and fascism together, prate about the attack of Hitler on the U.S.S.R. as a "private affair" in which the American people have no stake. The Negro masses reject these slanders. They equally reject the Schuylers and Crosswaiths who repeat Charlie McCarthy-like the vicious slanders of the pro-Hitlerites.

The Negro people are fighting to build our defenses and for the right to bear arms with the manly dignity befitting the democratic traditions of our country; befitting free men, citizens of a democracy. They know that the heroic Red Army is not just an army of Russians alone but a multi-national army; an army without Jim-Crowism, segregation or any of the ugly practices of racial or national prejudices; an army based on the equal status of the free and fraternal peoples of the U.S.S.R. They know that the Red Army is gloriously resisting the Nazi hordes on behalf of all humanity, in a struggle which, as Stalin declared, "will merge with the struggle of the peoples of Europe and America for their independence, for democratic liberties," precisely because of that genuine equality, unshakable unity and real social security which constitute the firm basis for the magnificent morale of the Red Army.

The Trade Unions and the Fight for Jobs for Negroes

The struggle for jobs for Negro workers, the struggle against job discrimination, is not the task of the Negro people alone. It is a vital task of the anti-Hitler forces generally, especially of labor. To assure real success, the trade unions must be in the center of this struggle.

The specific tasks of the unions are as follows:

1. In closed shops where there are no Negroes, efforts should be made to place the problem of jobs for Negroes before the union membership. The purpose of such efforts should be, in the first place, to have the union open its membership rolls to Negro workers for all categories of work within the particular industry, and, secondly, to secure the cooperation of the unions in fighting against the discriminatory policy of the employers. The approach to this problem should be placed on the basis of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new hirings, so as to leave no doubt that this demand of Negro workers is not made at the expense of white workers now on the job.

2. In closed shops where Negroes are employed but are restricted to unskilled jobs, the membership of the unions, as well as the leadership, should be approached with the aim of winning the support of the unions in the fight against this discrimination. The unions should be encouraged to adopt resolutions and where possible to include in their constitutions clauses against discrimination.

3. In organized shops where there is no closed shop and where Negroes are employed but are restricted to unskilled occupations, the unions must take the lead in the fight for advancement and promotion of Negro workers to skilled jobs. In negotiations for new contracts clauses should be incorporated which outlaw discriminatory practices.

4. In organized shops where there are no Negroes, the unions should advance special demands for the employment of Negroes, and their membership books should be opened to Negro workers. This demand for employment must include skilled as well as unskilled jobs. This attitude must be expressed in all new agreements. Depending upon the special situation in each given industry of this character, the unions should consider special demands in order to give concrete expression to this proposal, so that, for example, a percentage of all new hirings may be Negro workers.

5. In unorganized shops employing Negroes the unions must take special care to see that the specific problems of Negro workers are raised and correctly related to the problems of all workers in the given industry. Such demands should include the type of work, wages, hours, etc., and be supplemented by a positive program of demands that applies to the particular industry.

6. In unorganized shops not employing Negro workers the struggle must be developed jointly by the unions, Negro organizations and other progressive groups. While raising the special demand for employment for Negro workers, care should be taken that the demand is not raised in such a way as to isolate large masses of white workers who can be won for the struggle, but rather that a special appeal be made to them, explaining the situation, its meaning and consequences. Recent experiences confirm the correctness of this approach. The fight for jobs for Negroes side by side with the struggle for organization can give powerful support to labor. The struggle for employment of Negroes can best be carried out at the present time in connection with the present expansionist program, especially in the aircraft industry. The most effective way to accomplish this is again by raising the question of percentage.

7. In all unions the provisions of the contracts should apply equally to Negro workers, especially as pertains to the question of seniority, both departmental and plant.

8. Constant vigilance by the trade unions, progressive groups and the Negro people's organizations is necessary as a guarantee against any hedging or delay in carrying

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out the agreement to hire Negroes.

9. The unions should be won for the support of the Marcantonio Bill H.R. 3994 now before Congress, which calls for the penalizing of managements receiving Federal money and pursuing a policy of discrimination toward Negro workers.

10. The unions must fight for equal opportunity for the training of Negro workers for all categories of work, through apprenticeship, the Federal and state vocational program and the National Youth Administration.

11. The unions and other progressive movements should carry on an aggressive educational campaign among the white workers, explaining to them the full significance of the employment of Negroes.

Joint councils should be established, consisting of labor leaders and representatives of the Negro people, bringing these problems to the very center of trade union activity, such as has been set up in Cleveland. Labor must help build and strengthen the progressive organizations of the Negro people. This fight for jobs, which demands a consistent proletarian approach, can be carried forward only on the basis of a vigorous struggle against all anti-Negro elements who obstruct the people's fight against fascism.

It is a fight that must be placed as a central problem of the union and tackled *consciously* in the most serious manner.

The historic achievements of the struggle for independence in 1776, the fight for the abolition of chattel slavery in 1861, and all the gains of labor and the people in the ensuing period are at stake in the present decisive democratic struggle for the defense of the nation from the Nazi menace. The Communist Party, in bringing forward boldly the fight for Negro equality in the U.S.A., has made unique contributions to the advance of the American labor movement and to the extension of American democratic liberties. Greater tasks in the struggle for the national liberation movement of the Negro people face the Communists today. The Communist Party, the Party of Browder and Foster, trained in the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, fully confident of the realization of the national front for an all-out effort to destroy Hitlerism, will live up to these tasks.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TWO QUESTIONS ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN UNDER CAPITALISM

BY A. LANDY

I

IF EVER women had need and cause to participate in the great historical struggles of society, it is today, when Hitler, the greatest menace to the freedom and equality of woman, has let loose his hordes against the whole world. The historic developments of the past few months, following Hitler's attack against the Soviet Union, have produced vast new reasons for even greater efforts to arouse the millions of women in defense of their interests. It has simultaneously opened up even greater possibilities to accomplish this than ever before. Today the women's movement has broader issues and greater tasks than at any time—tasks common to all sections of women in the United States, the millions of employed women, the even greater millions of working class housewives, the toiling women of city and farm, the professional and middle class women.

Even prior to June 22, when the whole world situation underwent a historic change, the war had given the question of work among women a particular urgency. Comrade Browder had noted that in a special speech to women during the Presidential election campaign of 1940. It was only natural, therefore, that the discussion that developed at that time on certain questions affecting work among women met with more than usual interest in our ranks. That discussion narrowed itself down to a few abstract theoretical questions on the utility of housework and the economic function of the housewife. But behind it was the bigger question of how to activize the millions of proletarian and lower middle-class housewives in the great historic struggles confronting the American people.

If, prior to June 22, the real question requiring discussion was how to transform these millions of women into an active political force, that question today assumes even greater urgency. If two months ago arguments about the usefulness of work in the home were hardly an adequate basis for developing the multiple issues of struggle arising out of the home, such arguments are even less helpful today when the dominant issues before all women are of the broadest political character and the arena of struggle is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as wide as the nation and as broad as the whole world.

However, there can be no doubt that the first thing that has to be done in any serious effort to activize the majority of women is to overcome the traditional underestimation of work among the housewives. Despite the gratifying advances registered by the labor movement in this respect during the past few years, this underestimation is so deep-rooted that only the most conscious struggle against it can help eliminate it. That struggle can be won because life itself is providing all the necessary conditions for its achievement. Events have unquestionably prepared millions of women in the home for eager and active participation in the soluion of the political and social tasks before the nation.

It is true that when you tell some people that the usefulness of housework is neither here nor there they will immediately seize on this as a justification for underestimating the need for work among the millions of housewives in America. But what is the theoretical source of the danger of such underestimation? Obviously it is not in the recognition that capitalism is more and more taking women into industry. Such underestimation could only arise from a failure to understand the *process* that is involved in any such tendency, a process which still leaves millions of housewives who will never be involved in industry under capitalism, while at the same time the millions of women wage-earners are not freed from the chores of the home. It could only arise from mistaking the trend for the end result, from thinking that the tendency to transform the housewife into an industrial worker eliminates at one blow the status of housewife and the problems connected with the home.

The way to overcome this underestimation is not by providing a set of arguments that appear to be more "friendly" to the housewife's status, that seem to affirm and strengthen her position as a housewife. The first requirement for overcoming this underestimation is to be absolutely clear as to what the basis is for such work. And the basis for work among housewives is to be found in the fact that they have real needs arising from the conditions imposed by capitalism upon the workers' and toiers' homes. This basis is not to be found in the housewife's alleged economic function of helping to reproduce labor power. It is not to be found in her usefulness to capitalism or in the dignity of her work in the home. To look for it along that road is useless and a serious mistake, the roots of which lie in the failure to hold fast to the contradictions of capitalist society, to the material factors of change and development as the source of struggle. The only result of such an error is to glorify and exaggerate the social role of the housewife and substitute "symbolic" description for exact scientific determination of the real relationships. It must be said that this is the road to Right opportunist mistakes and to a loss of perspective as to the primary role of the proletariat employed directly in industry, and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

above all of the economic organizations of the working class as the primary instrument in the defense of the home.

The following discussion aims to amplify this by examining the two questions that have been the subject of debate in recent months.

II

The first question concerns the usefulness of woman's work in the home. Of course the housewife's work is useful. It is useful by virtue of the fact that it satisfies the wants of a group of people, and to the extent that it does that, there can be no question of the usefulness of such work to these people. After all, the housewife performs certain activities which contribute to the functioning of the family under the conditions imposed by capitalism. It is self-evident, therefore, that these activities are useful.

But it is also self-evident that this fact is of no special importance either for the scientific analysis of the housewife's position in society or for the formulation of a program of practical demands, not to speak of its utter uselessness as an argument for socialism. Granted that a housewife's work is useful. So is the labor of a shoemaker who has spent two days making a pair of shoes by hand. Someone can certainly make good use of those shoes, but the fact remains that the labor expended was far from socially necessary in view of the fact that modern industry can make the same pair of shoes in a tiny fraction of the time spent by the handicraft shoemaker.

The real question, therefore, is whether the work performed is socially necessary, and this, not in the sense of whether work in the home or the production of shoes is necessary in society. For, as long as people have homes and wear shoes, it is obvious that shoes will be made and housework will be done in one way or another, and that such work will be of a useful character. The only legitimate question is whether this work is performed in accord wih the technical level achieved by the development of the productive forces. And here it must be said that most of the individual drudgery characteristic of housework under capitalism is unnecessary in view of the technical achievements of society.

It is from this fact, and not from the bare and inconsequential statement that housework is useful, that it is possible to draw important conclusions both as regards a program of immediate demands and as regards the need for socialism. The fact that the housewife is condemned to drudgery despite the material possibilities of freeing her from it is only further evidence that capitalism has outlived its usefulness and must be replaced by socialism. Similarly, the difficulties and misery connected wih the home under capitalism, and not the usefulness or dignity of the work performed in it, are the ground out of which the immediate issues of struggle grow.

Two Approaches

The theoretical significance of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this is evident the moment we examine into the nature of the two different approaches involved here. No one, of course, is merely interested in establishing academically whether housework is useful or not. The question is whether by emphasizing this fact and taking it as the point of departure in an approach to the housewives it will be possible to involve millions of housewives in the people's struggles. The answer to this is contained in the very essence of Marxist theory, which teaches us that both the struggle for immediate demands and the socialist reconstruction of society have a common source in the *contradictions* inherent in capitalist society. These contradictions alone are the source of mass struggle and they rest on the solid foundation of the material productive forces of society. Thus to help the millions of women, the majority of whom are housewives, to take part in the struggle for immediate demands and to learn the need for socialism from their own experiences in this struggle, we must base our teachings and activity on the *contradiction* between the material possibilities for their liberation provided by modern industry and the subjection imposed upon them by capitalist production relations. It is only along this road that we will find the answer to the really important question of how to activize the millions of women.

We can see this very concretely. Any program of immediate demands for the millions of housewives would necessarily involve such issues as better housing, cheaper rents, the high cost of living, day nurseries, free lunches for school children and a host of other issues arising out of the maintenance of the home. All these demands derive their force from the physical needs of the housewives and their families, from the fact that society has the material resources to meet these demands, and from the even more vital fact that the capitalist production relations stand between the toilers and these resources. It is obvious that if, in their struggle to live, there were no need for the mass of the people to overcome certain restrictions imposed upon them by the capital-wage labor relationship, there would be no demands and no struggle. If the millions of housewives, as members of the working class and toiling population, were not circumscribed by the conditions of the capitalist exploitation of labor—in short, if there were no contradictions between their struggle to live and the socio-economic conditions in which this struggle takes place, there would be no need of activizing these millions of women. It is only in this *contradiction* that the struggle for the housewives' demands can be theoretically or even practically grounded. By the same token, however, the very conditions that give rise to the struggle and impress their specific nature on it make it a struggle not to maintain the status of the housewife (in effect the status of a drudge and the "slave of a slave") in bourgeois-imposed conditions of life, but to overcome these conditions as part of the basic proletarian struggle.

Likewise, to convince these mil-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lions of housewives of the need for socialism, it is necessary to show them that socialism will liberate them in every respect—from the misery of capitalist life, from the drudgery of housework, from the inequalities and discrimination practiced against them daily. In other words, the argument for socialism must also be based on the irreconcilable antagonism between the millions of housewives and the consequences of the capitalist production relations. It must be based on a *rejection* and not on an affirmation of these relations as materially outmoded and unnecessary. There is no other way of arguing for socialism.

Now it is quite obvious that you cannot ground the need for socialism in the rejection of capitalism and at the same time ground the program of immediate demands in an affirmation of the housewife's usefulness to capitalism. Such a procedure simply throws overboard the scientifically established Marxist principle that there is the closest organic connection between the struggle for immediate demands and the struggle for the ultimate establishment of socialism. The masses can learn the need for socialism out of their own experience only if that experience demonstrates an irreconcilable antagonism and contradiction to capitalism.

But what is the nature of the "usefulness" approach? Where does it lead us? It leads us to look for the source of struggle not in the contradiction but in the *contribution* of the housewife to capitalism. This is necessarily so because the whole point to the argument about the usefulness of housework is that it is useful and necessary to the functioning of capitalist society. How does it help the capitalist system function? *It does this by helping capital to reproduce labor power as wage-labor!* This "useful" contribution may be a source of dignity to the housewife, as some people prefer to believe, although it is hard to see what dignity there is in the role of helping capital to reproduce the laborer as a wage slave; but it is certainly not a source of struggle. If it is anything, it is a source of *reconciliation* with the capitalist system. For it is obvious that in taking the emphasis on the "usefulness" of the housewife as the starting point of our tactics, we necessarily make the housewife's "contribution" the dominant feature of the relationship between herself and the capitalist system and not the *antagonism,* the contradiction and conflict between herself and the capitalist system. If we insist on assuring the housewife that she has a useful, dignified role to play in the capitalist system, what logical obstacle do we put in the way of the housewife's drawing the conclusion that it is desirable to perpetuate this role and of course the system that goes with it? Such an approach merely provides the logical mood and atmosphere of accommodation to the capitalist system, if not to all of its daily conditions. It is certainly not a *revolutionary* approach, to say the least.

Generally, it must be said that the Marxist social and economic theory is a theory of the *exploitation* of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor and not of the usefulness of labor to the functioning of the capitalist system. It is quite generally recognized that the labor of the working class is very useful to the capitalists, but no Marxist would ever dream of grounding the struggle between labor and capital in anything but the irreconcilable contradictions between the two classes. Is there any scientific reason for treating the question of women's relations to capitalism in any other way?

The only apparent justification for the "usefulness" approach is that it is an effective way to rally the housewives, especially because it provides them with a moral right to make demands in their own name upon capitalist society. It need not be emphasized that neither of the two reasons advanced here has anything in common with Marxism.

The first argument consists in urging the recognition of the usefulness and dignity of the housewife's work on *pragmatic* grounds, that is, on the ground that "it works." But this is tantamount to a surrender of any basic theoretical analysis of the position of women under capitalism and the tactics that *necessarily* flow from such an analysis. Marxism bases its tactics not on temporary appearances but on the scientific foundation of materialist analysis; otherwise they cannot be *reasoned* tactics; they cannot have the certainty of science if they are based on anything but the real contradictions of capitalist society. The cunning, clever utilization of the "sentiments," prejudices or illusions of the masses is neither in the spirit nor the tradition of Marxism-Leninism. It is true that Marxism always takes the masses as they are, but only as the starting point of its tactics in order to be able better to conform to the *objective* forces of development which determine the course of all individuals, groups and classes in society.

The second argument, the ethical argument, is even less acceptable and suffers from the same organic defect as the whole "usefulness" approach. The housewife does not need any moral right grounded in some useful function in capitalist economy in order to be entitled to make demands upon the capitalist class. Her "right" to make demands does not stem from her "usefulness" but from her character as a human being, a member of the working class and toiling population who is oppressed and subjugated. It is this oppressed and subjugated status that is the sole source of her "right" to make demands. That certainly is reason enough for demands on society! That is why Marxism can rightfully claim to stand for the emancipation of *all* women, regardless of class or occupation.

However, emphasis on the usefulness and dignity of housework also suffers from another fatal theoretical shortcoming as a point of departure for tactics. By grounding our approach in the *contradictions* between the housewives and their social conditions, we ground it in the source of change and development in society, in the dynamic, active elements, the elements of movement. On the other hand, by grounding our explanation in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

useful function of housework, we ground it in a relatively static element which obviously has no connection with the generation of movement. And just as the first requirement of Marxist-Leninist analysis is to uncover the *contradictions* in society, so the second requirement is to base ourselves on the forces of development and change and not on the static elements. It is obvious that these forces of development and change are to be found only in the contradictions of society.

After all, the mere fact that housework is useful does not make it a source of development or of social progress. On the contrary, it is in the nature of housework under capitalism to remove the housewife from the main stream of social change and development. The source of that development is to be found only in the productive forces embodied in modern industry, which provides the primary channel for involving masses of both men and women in the historical struggle. And this is so for the simple reason that only here are they brought face to face with the main struggle of modern society, the struggle between capital and labor, thanks to the central determining role of the material productive forces on social development. By being absorbed into industry, women are transformed from a relatively dormant section of the working class into an active proletarian force. No matter how useful the woman's work is in the home, it is common knowledge that the drudgery of housework is not the most productive source of social consciousness, organization-mindedness or generally of advanced thought. The great contribution of the C.I.O. to the women's movement in the last few years consists precisely in its organization of auxiliaries that have served to bring the proletarian housewives out of the home into the main stream of the social struggle. Any approach to work among women, and especially among the millions of housewives, that does not take this as its starting point not only deprives itself of the *objective* foundation of materialism and the certainty of objective reality, but automatically condemns itself to hopeless subjectivism in tactics and politics.

It is no accident, therefore, that the "usefulness" approach lays stress on the wrong task. Unavoidably it imposes on us the task of "proving" to the housewives that their place *in* the home is useful and dignified. Actually, however, our task is just the opposite of this. To activize millions of housewives, it is necessary to take them *out of the home* into the broad arena of the class struggle, even when using the issues created by the home. Our task is to convince them that their place is in a greater arena than just the four walls of their kitchens, the arena of the great social struggle, and that they will improve their home conditions and ultimately achieve complete emancipation from misery by participating in this struggle. Naturally that task requires that we approach the women *in the home*, raising the demands connected with the problems of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

home, but in order to take the women out into the arena of the historic process and ally them with the driving forces of that process. For, in the last analysis, there is no other way to defend the interests specifically associated with the housewife, the family and the home. This means that we must recognize the primary role played by the employed working class and its organizations. By the same token, the factory and the trade union and the mass movements take precedence over the home as the main location of the arena of that struggle.

What has been said so far is exactly what Earl Browder pointed out, only much more simply, concretely and clearly, in a special speech to the women during the 1940 Presidential election campaign. If we quote Comrade Browder's remarks at great length it is because they indicate the main outlines of our approach to work among women and at the same time present in a concrete and living form all the elements necessary for a theoretical analysis of the question under discussion.

The ruling class of the dying capitalist system, Comrade Browder declared, is driving the women out of the seclusion of their homes and is "roughly thrusting women by the millions into the great social struggles."

"The Communist Party," he said, "sets itself the task to mobilize and win the leadership of the overwhelming majority of the people, men and women, for the immediate protection of their living standards, and for the eventual transformation of society into socialism. . . . Our foundation and starting point is among the industrial wage workers, men and women, and from these we recruit the vanguard, the backbone, the leaders, of our movement. . . . But we must never lose sight of our task to win the majority, and the majority also among the women, that means the women in the homes of America, the housewives. . . . [However] only a small minority of women have sustained experience as workers in modern machine industry. Yet it is such experience alone which educates, drills and disciplines the masses engaged therein in such a way as to create that class solidarity, class consciousness *and class experience* which is the foundation of the labor movement in general and of the Communist movement in particular. . . . Only a small minority of women gain this education directly by their own experience; most of them can absorb it only vicariously, through their fathers, brothers, husbands and sons; they are still excluded from basic machine industry. . . .

"Look at the larger number of women whose principal occupation is managing the homes, whose men comprise the eight million trade union members today. Are the more than eight million wives, mothers, daughters of these trade union members anywhere near an equal source of strength to the labor movement as the men? We know they are not; but we also know that they could be! *And precisely there is the problem which sets the main task of our work among women.* . . .

"For as long as the mass of women are not drawn in their interests and activities into the same stream as their men, just that long

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

also are the masses of men not pulling their own full weight in the movement, but are torn between two influences which should be directed harmoniously to the same end, but which are needlessly and harmfully antagonistic and at cross purposes. . . . For the great mass of working class housewives, even when they have reconciled themselves to the demands of the union upon their menfolk, there is still more or less of conflict with those demands, the feeling that the labor movement is a rival to the home in its demands upon the time and thought of the menfolk. Indeed, this problem is not entirely absent in the families of Communists in relation to the Party. . . .

"The problem of extending our work among the women is, therefore, first of all a problem for the men, for them to assume the responsibility to win over their wives, mothers, daughters and cousins and bring them into active organic participation in the labor movement, in the work of the Party. The women already involved must become ever more adequate spokesmen for the needs and desires of their less articulate and unorganized sisters and stir them to activity and self-expression. This advance guard of women, by their increasingly effective participation in the general social and political life . . . will inspire by example the great masses of women to overcome the inhibitions and difficulties which hold them back in their old narrow grooves, and release a great flood of new and fresh forces for the common cause."

For the purpose of our discussion it is sufficient to note two basic features of these remarks.

First, they recognize the home as a retarding influence on the housewife due to the isolation of the kitchen, as compared with the progressive influence of industry on the men and women engaged in it. The home as such is outside the main arena of the historical struggle and is thus a *secondary* even though important source of struggle. In fact, the home places the housewives outside of production and its educating and disciplining influence. In order to win the housewives and involve them in the historical movement, it is necessary to depend upon the initiative of the forces that come from industry and the organized labor movement.

Secondly, they recognize the economic organizations of labor, that is, the trade unions, as primary even in the struggle for the demands connected directly with the home. Without powerful trade unions the housewives cannot wage a successful struggle in defense of their specific demands, because in the last analysis these demands involve a sum total of aspects that make up the maintenance of the home, first of which are wages and living standards, and concessions on other demands can hardly be won if the organized labor movement is weak. For this reason, winning the housewives for the struggle acquires strategic importance as a means of strengthening the unions, while failure to do this only constitutes an element of weakness for them.

There can be no doubt that this is a line for the defense of the home against the destructive effects of capitalist economy. But the defense

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the home as Comrade Browder projects it is something entirely different from defense of housework. It is in essence a defense of the right to live and not of the function of the housewife imposed upon her by capitalism. This whole line therefore moves in an entirely different realm and depends upon altogether different elements from those involved in the "usefulness" approach. It bases its defense of the home on the struggle of the *whole* toiling population, grounds it in the struggle against the exploitation of wage-labor as the ultimate source of the housewife's problems, and gives primacy in this struggle to the militant movement and economic organization of labor produced by the operation of modern industry. In the last analysis, therefore, it rests the defense of the home on something much more substantial than the utility of housework or the function of the housewife in capitalist economy, useful or otherwise. It rests it on the class struggle arising from the ownership and development of the social productive forces. It is thus one thing to rally the housewives around demands connected with the home; it is another thing to eulogize housework, which for the majority of women under capitalism can only be a source of domestic slavery, intellectual stultification and economic dependence.

III

We now come to the second question: Do housewives get paid for their work, that is, do they receive wages? The answer to this question enables us to develop still further the discussion regarding the usefulness of housework, for it is essentially an elaboration of this first question from a more specific economic angle. The economic argument for the usefulness of housework is that capitalist industry cannot exist without the domestic economy represented by the woman's household duties; for fulfiling this economic function the housewife is supposed to get a subsistence wage.

Let us begin with the first part of this argument. Marxism has always maintained that capitalist industry cannot exist without *wage-labor;* that is the distinguishing feature of capitalism. But Marxism never found in the work of the housewife a particularly characteristic feature of capitalist society. It has certainly never made the existence of capitalism dependent upon the woman's housework. If there is anything characteristic of capitalism in relation to housework it is that it tends to divorce it completely from the process of social production. When it wants to involve women in production, it takes them out of the home and puts them into the factory, since modern industry is not carried on in the home and the time is gone when domestic work constituted the foundation of social economy. *What is therefore essentially a process of divorcing the housewife from any role in production, inasmuch as she is confined exclusively to the duties of the home, is erroneously advanced as evidence of a vital economic function.* Actually this function begins

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

again only when the woman is drawn into industry.

To determine the economic character of the tasks performed in the home, we have to look outside of the process of production. Economically, they are part of the process of consumption. True, even this process cannot take place without an expenditure of energy; but it is obviously a crude economic fallacy to identify the work entailed in the process of individual consumption with the labor involved in the process of production, just as it is equally fallacious to identify consumption with production on the ground that in the last analysis consumption is only a preliminary to the renewal of production. The one is the basis of the worker's existence; the other is the basis of capitalist exploitation. Thus, unless we hold fast to this distinction, we not only make any kind of *scientific* analysis impossible but we throw overboard the whole concept of exploitation and surplus value inherent in the wage form of capitalist society, as we shall see shortly in the examination of wages. To assign the housewife a role in social production, therefore, when it is only her husband who is actually involved in it, is simply to confuse all economic categories, obliterating the source of surplus value and profit.

The tactical significance of this economic characterization of housework is immediately apparent to every Marxist. *Both in its scientific analysis of social development and in the determination of its political tactics, Marxism bases itself on the primacy of production and not on the primacy of consumption.* Here we see another aspect of the theoretical reason why, in working out a program of struggle for the home, we must tie it up closely with the elements and forces connected with production, as already indicated in the answer to the first question.

Even from what has been said thus far, it is evident that the housewife does not get paid wages, unless she is directly employed as a housekeeper or works otherwise for an employer. There is certainly no economic reason for contending that the fact that the husband receives wages transforms his wife into a wage worker of his employer. If all the employer had to do to make profit out of his worker's wife was to pay her husband wages, there would be no point in taking her out of the home into the factory. Obviously, therefore, the housewife can be said to be paid wages only if we abuse the strict meaning of that term. And here it must be said categorically that there is absolutely no justification in economics, politics or tactics for using terms that have a strictly scientific meaning in a free and "symbolic" sense. The indiscriminate use of the terms "paid and unpaid labor" and "wages" simply deprives them of all exact meaning and consequently of any scientific validity, and if they lack that they are utterly worthless in the formulation of any scientifically grounded and reasoned tactics. It must not be forgotten that Marxism has had to wage a serious scientific struggle to lay bare the significance of the wage form, and we cannot

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

afford to fall below that scientific level of struggle.

Wages by their very nature represent the price paid for labor power expended in the process of capitalist production under conditions that result in a profit for the employer. In those types of employment where wages are paid for personal services, the wages come out of the employer's consumption fund and not out of his production fund —a distinction the importance of which the capitalist class fully understands, since all its funds have their ultimate origin in the process of production.

The housewife is not engaged in production, and her only connection with it, economically speaking, is through the consumption of its products made possible by the expenditure of the wages paid for the labor power of her husband. The housewife is engaged in helping to consume the wages brought home by her husband. Even where housework is actually performed by a paid domestic worker, the wages received stem from the consumption fund of the employer and not from his production fund, as we have already noted. Where the employer of a housekeeper is himself a wage worker, it is immediately obvious that he has no production fund. All he has is his wages from which he pays for all services. In neither case, therefore—whether in that of the hired housekeeper or that of the housewife—are the houseworkers engaged in the surplus-value creating process, that is, in the production of profit for the capitalist class. In the case of the working class family, the capitalist certainly has no reason for paying wages to the housewife who is not even engaged in his own personal service, his only "connection" with her being that he employs her husband. This does not mean that the husband need not fight for a wage adequate to support himself, his wife and family, but it does mean that the relationship of the proletarian housewife and the capitalist is not that of wage-earner and employer.

In capitalist society it is only that work which is performed for the capitalist that brings in wages. Work performed for oneself is not a source of wages, and housework, after all, is only work for one's own family. And since the capitalists pay wages primarily with the object of making profit, they certainly do not use the term wages indiscriminately or rush to pay out wages to anybody and everybody. They are very careful to distinguish between that labor which is productive of profit and that which is not. And in the eyes of the captalist only that labor which results in a profit is productive. That labor which only satisfies his personal consumption is unproductive to him.

Now if the capitalist justifiably refuses to regard work performed for his own personal consumption as a source of profit—even though he has to pay wages for it—he certainly will not pay wages for work performed for the personal consumption of someone else, in this case the housework of the proletarian family. What he is ready to pay for, aside from direct personal service, is that type of labor power which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

produces surplus value for him and such labor power he cannot gainfully employ on the chores of the worker's home but only at the machines in his own factory.

It is significant that even the working class is compelled by the wage system to regard all of its housework as "unproductive" work for itself. The wife may work like a horse in the house, but economically she is said not to be working because she isn't working for a capitalist; in plain words, she hasn't got a job. In speaking of just this type of housework, Marx said in his "Theories of Surplus Value" (Vol. I, p. 271):

"The overwhelming majority of society, that is, the working class, must perform this kind of work for themselves [*i.e.*, they cannot employ anyone to do it for them—*A.L.*]; but they can only do it if they have worked 'productively' [*i.e.*, have worked for someone else for wages—*A.L.*]. They can only cook meat if they have produced a wage with which to pay for meat; and they can only keep their furniture and houses clean and polish their shoes if they have produced the value of furniture, rent and shoes. This class of productive workers therefore regards that work as unproductive which they must do for themselves. This unproductive work never enables them to repeat anew this unproductive work if they have not previously worked productively [that is, for wages—*A.L.*]."

In other words, housework is not a source of wages, is not productive, and only employment by a capitalist provides the precondition for the performance of this housework. It is therefore not the housewife that has the relationship to the employer, but the husband; it is not housework, but factory work that is the source of wages. If it is true that it is only through the husband and his wages that the housewife has access to the products of social production, it is not true that the relationship between the husband and the wife is one of an intermediary between her and his employer.

One might of course try to convince the capitalists that the housewife is really an unsung and unheralded worker whose labor is an unrecognized source of surplus value and profit to them. But the capitalists apparently don't believe it and they are perfectly capable of recognizing a source of profit when they see it, as indicated by their very strict distinction between productive and unproductive labor, between wages paid out of their production fund and wages paid out of their consumption fund. As experienced appropriators of surplus value, they know that when they lay out capital for labor power, the only way it results in a surplus for themselves is when they put the laborer to work at their means of production and compel him to expend enough of his personal physical and mental energy to reproduce not only his own wage but a profit for them. They know, of course, that back home the worker has a wife and children and possibly a family doctor and music teacher for these children, all of whom depend upon

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his wages for their subsistence. But since they are interested only in their profits, they are concerned only with the direct use of the labor power of the man they have employed and not with the wife, the children, the doctor or the teacher, all of whom undoubtedly have a place in the physical and mental life of the worker.

It is of course possible to say that the capitalist couldn't exploit the worker if back of him there were not his wife, his doctor, etc., to help maintain and preserve his labor power. That is true enough, but the same is true of the sun and the air, without which the worker would certainly not be able to reproduce his labor power. In fact any and all elements without which the capitalists would have no worker to exploit may be regarded as contributing to the capitalists' profit. That is why, if we are going to speak of the wife as receiving wages from the capitalist class, we shall also have to say that the family doctor, for example, also gets wages from the capitalist class, for no one will deny the important and useful role the doctor plays in helping to keep the laborer alive. However, the moment we start doing this with the concept of wages we immediately obscure the role of the laborer, that is, the actual producer as the source of the capitalists' profit; we distort the relationship between the producers of the actual goods consumed by society and the various individuals that take part in the consumption, and perpetuate the illusion that capital is really the provider for all sections of society.

To illustrate this with an example from Marx, everyone knows how important the soldier can be in protecting the labor of the producers against foreign invasion. Production would be impossible without the contribution of the soldier. And yet everyone can see immediately that it is not the soldier who takes part in the actual process of production, but on the contrary is maintained by its products. It is also obvious that even though production could not go on without the protection of the soldier, production is still primary and the sole source of all members of society. In other words, the process of production involves many more elements than those required for its technical operation and yet it is precisely this technical process that is the basis for the maintenance of all these other elements.

It is clear, therefore, that to understand the precise nature of the process of exploitation involved in the wage system it is necessary to be much more accurate in our distinctions, establishing the real relationship between the various elements that enter into the total picture. In the last analysis, domination of society by the capitalist class enables it to exact a tribute from all other members of society, and, in this sense, everybody may be said to be "working for" the capitalists, but if that is all we can say about the matter, we are no further advanced than the French petty-bourgeois writer Proudhon, who declared that "property is theft," and Marx might just as well never have written a word. Such a generalization may be useful for agitational

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

purposes but it is worthless for any scientific analysis of the capitalist system and the process of exploitation on which it is based.

What then is the actual relationship between the housewife and her wage-earning husband? *Economically that relationship is that her domestic activities enter into the cost of production and reproduction of her husband's labor power—but do not themselves create the fund from which her sustenance derives.* That means that the husband's wage must be enough to provide for the existence of his wife, but the value of the means of subsistence represented by that wage is the product of the husband's labor and not of the wife's. Her *economic* relationship to her husband is substantially the same as the relationship of the family doctor to the husband: both help to maintain the husband's labor power, but, in doing that, neither of them thereby sells his own labor power to the husband's employer and consequently neither of them gets wages from him.

The mere fact that the wife does physical *work* at home for herself and family makes her activities useful to them, but that is all. *The usefulness of housework does not depend on its being paid. On the contrary, it is useful despite the fact that in capitalist economy housework is not paid work. It is not in its paid or unpaid character that its economic essence lies, but rather in its being work for the family and not for a capitalist, and when the work is not for a capitalist it produces no wages unless the husband directly hires his wife as a domestic worker and pays for her labor power at a given rate.*

The housewife does not produce a single commodity in the home, not even the commodity labor power, even though she helps to maintain it, just as the doctor does not produce any commodity when he helps the worker to maintain his labor power. And yet, only when the commodity labor power is sold are wages received. To speak of paid labor in the case of the housewife can only mean that her husband is her employer. This is obviously a distortion of the family relationship, and, instead of convincing the housewife that she is also a victim of the exploitation suffered by her husband at the hands of the capitalist, it only transforms the husband into an employer of his wife! In other words, instead of husband and wife appearing as joint victims of the capitalist class, the "woman question" emerges as a challenge to the whole conception of exploitation as a class phenomenon.

It can, of course, be argued that to deny that the housewife is paid for her labor is to place her in the position of living off her husband's labor in a state of economic dependence. Whether we like it or not, that is exactly the case under capitalism, and any "theory" that the housewife is paid for her labor only serves as a gratuitous whitewash of one of the unmistakably reactionary aspects of capitalism. It is certainly not our job to come to the rescue of capitalism by trying to "argue" this basic economic and social fact away. After all, it is not we who are responsible for this

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

state of affairs, which only provides one more reason why women should want socialism and which can only be combated if we recognize its existence.

It may also be argued that by making the housewife feel that she helps to produce her husband's wages she will more readily join him in the struggle for better conditions. But that is hardly a justification for telling the housewife that she also gets paid for her labor. It is not necessary to resort to myths to convince housewives that they belong to the working class. To do this is to "legalize" the use of concepts that do not correspond to reality and actually falsify the real relationships. That is not Marxism. That is the syndicalist Sorel's "myth" theory according to which a concept need not be true as long as the masses believe in it and will act on it. Actually, it is because the husband has part of his labor *unpaid* and not that the housewife's labor is *paid* — in a word, it is because the husband is exploited that the housewife's position is wretched and miserable. Here we have the substance of the answer to both questions posed in this article.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

DIALECTICS OF NATURE, by Frederick Engels. Translated and edited by Clement Dutt, with a preface and notes by J. B. S. Haldane, F.R.S. Marxist Library, Vol. XXVII. International Publishers, New York.

IN HIS brief but very pertinent preface, which is intended primarily for the English and American intellectuals and advanced workers, J. B. S. Haldane describes the essence of the Marxian method. He cites numerous interesting examples to show that Marxism does not confine itself only to the investigation of social phenomena (as many people abroad believe to this day). As an integrated world outlook Marxism includes the study of nature as well. In combating the arguments of those who think that scientific problems, like the problem of tautomerism in chemistry or individuality in biology, are no concern of Marxists, Haldane cites the example of Lenin. He relates how in 1908, when the first Russian Revolution had ended in defeat, Lenin fought to safeguard the theoretical foundations of the Bolshevik Party and wrote *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,** in which he not only criticized the views of philosophers such as Mach and Pearson, but also analyzed the general philosophical significance of the discoveries of physicists such as Hertz, J. J. Thomson, Bequerel and Curie.

Warmly recommending Engels' book, Haldane emphasizes its importance at the present moment. An acquaintance with this book, he says, is needed for a proper approach not only to phenomena of nature, but also to the complicated events of social life. He draws attention to the fact that in *Dialectics of Nature* Engels "lays particular emphasis on the interconnection of all processes, and the artificial character of the distinctions which men have drawn, not merely between vertebrates and invertebrates or liquids and gases, but between the different fields of human knowledge." (p. xv.)

Referring to the method of the Marxist philosophy, Haldane points out that "a very careful and condensed summary" of this philosophy is given in Chapter IV of the *History of the C.P.S.U.*, which he recommends as a source of study alongside other works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism.

"Just because it is a living philosophy with innumerable concrete applications," he writes, "its full power

* V. I. Lenin, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, International Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and importance can only be gradually understood, when we see it applied to history, science, or whatever field of study. . . ." (p. xv.) At the same time he points out: "But it must not be thought that *Dialectics of Nature* is only of interest to scientists. Any educated person, and, above all, anyone who is a student of philosophy will find much to interest him or her throughout the book." (p. xiv.)

And further he says: "A reader whose concern lies primarily in the political or economic field will come back to his main interest a better dialectical materialist, and therefore a clearer-sighted politician or economist, after studying how Engels applied dialectics to nature." (p. xv.)

"One reason why Engels was such a great writer," says Haldane, "is that he was probably the most widely educated man of his day. Not only had he a profound knowledge of economics and history, but he knew enough to discuss the meaning of an obscure Latin phrase concerning Roman marriage law, or the processes taking place when a piece of impure zinc was dipped into sulphuric acid. And he contrived to accumulate this immense knowledge, not by leading a life of cloistered learning, but while playing an active part in politics. . . .

"He needed this knowledge because dialectical materialism, the philosophy which, along with Marx, he founded, is not merely a philosophy of history, but a philosophy which illuminates all events whatever, from the falling of a stone to a poet's imaginings."

His profound appreciation of Engels' book enables Haldane to link up the publication of the English translation of *Dialectics of Nature* with the present world situation, showing the reader what a powerful theoretical weapon it provides, and how important this weapon is in our days. He winds up his preface with the following words:

"At the present moment, clear thinking is vitally necessary if we are to understand the extremely complicated situation in which the whole human race, and our own nation in particular, is placed, and to see the way out of it to a better world. A study of Engels will warn us against some of the facile solutions which are put forward today, and help us to play an intelligent and courageous part in the great events of our own time." (pp. xv-xvi.)

These lines were written at the very beginning of the present world war (the preface is dated November, 1939). They show that the progressive intellectuals abroad are fully aware that only the method of revolutionary dialectics—the only correct scientific method—provides the key to the solution of the problems of the day, helping people to realize what is the way out of the indescribable horrors and torments into which imperialism has plunged the majority of the human race. The call of J. B. S. Haldane, the prominent English scientist, to all the progressive sections of present-day capitalist society to study the classics of Marxism-Leninism, if they are to understand the events and find their place in the impending social battles, chimes in with the sentiments that inspired the People's Convention held in Lon-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

don in January, 1941. As we know, Professor Haldane was very active in the People's Convention movement and is a member of the National Committee elected at the Convention.

His is a concrete instance showing how closely theoretical work on the Marxist philosophy is associated with the practical struggle.

* * *

Dialectics of Nature is of special interest for scientists, since it deals with material on natural science.

Professor Haldane points out that the book was written sixty years ago, and since then science has made great progress. That is why some of the *details* in the book, relating to various branches of the natural sciences, have become antiquated. The views concerning the origin of the solar system have changed considerably since the days when Engels wrote his *Dialectics of Nature*. Still greater changes have taken place in the theory of the structure of matter. Some of the discoveries to which Engels referred have not been confirmed by subsequent research. One of these was the theory of the so-called "Monera," regarded by the biologists of those days as a simple granule of protein devoid of the organic structure which is the property of the living cell.

But, as Haldane points out, the question is not of details, but of the *substance* of Engels' brilliant book, and that substance is contained in the Marxist dialectical method which Engels so masterfully applied to science. The interest of some of the essays that make up Engels' work "lies not so much in their detailed criticism of theories, many of which have ceased to be of importance, but in showing how Engels grappled with intellectual problems." (p. x.) It is this substance that Albert Einstein, the famous physicist, failed to discern when a section of Engels' manuscript was submitted to him for his opinion in 1924.

Modern science, Haldane shows, has corroborated the propositions of dialectical materialism formulated by Engels; for instance, the statement that matter is unthinkable without motion. In a footnote to this statement he writes: "Physicists who had not read Engels were startled by the recent discovery that even in the neighborhood of the absolute zero of heat atoms are still in vigorous internal motion." (p. 36.) Haldane cites fresh and extremely interesting examples to illustrate some of Engels' ideas. Thus, for instance, to the note on "Motion and Equilibrium" he adds the following comment: "The truth of this statement is constantly being demonstrated afresh. For example, it has been shown that during life even the bones, which appear so solid, are constantly exchanging phosphorous atoms with the blood." (p. 170.)

Professor Haldane cites facts from modern astrophysics to illustrate Engels' statement that "even in the sun the different substances are dissociated and without distinction in their action."

Haldane's comment follows: "In the sun (save for a few compounds in its outer layers) all matter is dissociated into atoms, and the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

atoms may lose some electrons. Thus all kinds of matter have the same mechanical properties, those of hot gas." (p. 158.)

He cites the very simple and at the same time very profound example of the rubbing of a match, to illustrate Engels' idea of the transformation (at a definite stage of quantitative change) of mechanical motion "into a permanent molecular change, a chemical change." Indeed, as Haldane points out, "if a match is rubbed lightly it is warmed and then cools down again, if rubbed harder it lights up." (*Ibid.*) Engels' statement that the so-called physical constants "are for the most part nothing but designations of the nodal points . . ." he illustrates with the example of the visible spectrum. (p. 30.)

Very interesting are the numerous notes in which Haldane cites facts to prove how the brilliant *predictions* made by Engels sixty years ago have been fully confirmed by subsequent developments. In his essay on electricity Engels foresaw the general main line of the development of physics and chemistry; he wrote that a closer investigation of the connection between chemical and electrical action "will lead to important results in both spheres of investigation." "This prophecy," writes Haldane, "has of course been amply fulfilled. Arrhenius' ionic theory has transformed chemistry, and Thomson's electron theory has revolutionized physics." (p. x.) Haldane shows how Engels was ahead of his time when he spoke of the sun's heat as a form of "repulsion," thus anticipating the discovery made by Lebedev in 1900 regarding the repulsion exercised by light. (p. 48.) Engels likewise anticipated the discovery of the fact that the heat of the sun is transformed into electricity or magnetism. This has been subsequently corroborated, for, as Haldane points out, "huge magnetic fields have been discovered in the sunspots, and it is also known that the matter shot out in solar prominences is electrically charged." (p. 15.) "It is astonishing," he remarks in his preface, "how Engels anticipated the progress of science in the sixty years which have elapsed since he wrote." (p. xii.)

Haldane's remarks dealing with biology are of particular interest. Biology is Haldane's specialty. In one case he makes the interesting attempt to link up Engels' statement that "life is the mode of existence of protein bodies" (pp. 195-6) with Stanley's recent discovery that "viruses" are large protein molecules. Engels' statement that non-cellular organisms "begin with a simple granule of protein"—the Monera—has turned out to be out of date only inasmuch as the very discovery of the Monera has never been corroborated. But Engels' brilliant idea that some intermediate, transitional forms must exist between the cell and the mere chemical structure of protein has now, in Haldane's opinion, found corroboration, even though not quite complete, in Stanley's discovery.

Haldane points out that "some of the ultra-microscopic viruses turn out to be single protein molecules. That is to say, they have no structure except the chemical structure that belongs to them as protein."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(p. 179.) It must be noted that the properties of the viruses have not as yet been fully established.

The following lines in Haldane's preface are very noteworthy:

"Had his [Engels'] remarks on Darwinism been generally known, I for one would have been saved a certain amount of muddled thinking. I therefore welcome wholeheartedly the publication of an English translation of *Dialectics of Nature*, and hope that future generations of scientists will find that it helps them to elasticity of thought." (p. xiv.)

These words are a brilliant confirmation of Engels' famous statement regarding the importance of the application of materialistic dialectics to the study of nature.

B. KEDROV

THE NEGRO IN THE ABOLITIONIST MOVEMENT, by Herbert Aptheker; International Publishers, New York, 1941; 15 cents.

HERBERT APTHEKER'S recent work, *The Negro in the Abolitionist Movement,* is a significant addition to his series of booklets on Negro history, including *Negro Slaves Revolts: 1526-1860, The Negro in the American Revolution,* and *The Negro in the Civil War.* All bring to light with necessary emphasis that phase of American history which, more than any other, has been so disgracefully neglected.

Aptheker commences his account with the following criticism of bourgeois histories of abolitionism: "The crusade against the institution of slavery in the United States has received two dominant types of treatment. Yet these have one thing in common: both 'forget' the Negro."

One group of historians consists of "chauvinistic, reactionary writers like Ralph V. Harlow, Avery Craven, and Arthur Y. Lloyd, who damned the Abolitionists (white people in every case) as mischievous fanatics at best." The other group, embracing such writers as Albert B. Hart, Gilbert H. Barnes, and Dwight L. Dumond, is sympathetic to the Abolitionist cause merely in a liberal or humanitarian manner, yet consistently treats the movement as a "white man's benevolent association." Reference is made to a recent work by Dumond which mentions scores of obscure white Abolitionists, yet has no mention of such outstanding Negro Abolitionists as Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, and Sojourner Truth. As though by common consent, all schools of white bourgeois historians have neglected to deal seriously with the great Negro fighters for freedom, thus perpetuating the utterly baseles slander that the Negro has always been "docile."

Only Negro historians and Marxists have ever dared dispel this myth. Dr. Woodson and other Negro writers have brought to light

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much material on the role of the Negro in the anti-slavery movement. Now Herbert Aptheker for the first time brings together in one single pamphlet significant data on this phase of their achievements.

Moreover, he demonstrates with great clearness the fundamentally revolutionary character of the Abolitionist movement, which "had as its aim the overthrow of a vested interest representing billions of dollars' worth of private property, and the realization in life of the Declaration of Independence, with its promise of equality and brotherhood for millions of dark-skinned people whose condition had made a mockery of that declaration."

Before dealing with the role of the Negro in the organized Abolitionist movement, Aptheker touches upon the long history of more or less spontaneous struggles. After some reference to the many insurrections and to the innumerable heroic escapes to the North and to Southern swamps from which fugitives defended themselves against raids and conducted guerrilla warfare, stress is laid on other phases of the struggle.

Vast numbers of Negroes engaged in heroic labors to accumulate funds with which to purchase either their own freedom or that of their relatives and friends. Some idea of the extent of this effort is indicated by the account of how, in 1834, 75 per cent of the free Negroes of Cincinnati had "worked out their own freedom," while many others were "toiling to purchase their friends." Through such direct, personal endeavors the horror of slavery was brought home to many and free Negroes became more actively involved in anti-slavery agitation.

In the great work of building the "Underground Railway," it was the Negroes themselves who took the first steps and who always did the major portion of the work. It was primarily in the homes of the free Negroes of the North that fugitives found refuge. Aptheker lists the names of many who were outstanding in these activities. There were others who "carried the war into Africa" by going into the South to raid plantations and assist escapes. While some whites, such as the great John Brown, engaged in this work, the overwhelming majority of those who undertook this most dangerous of all struggles were Negro, the greatest among them being the famous Harriet Tubman.

A glowing account is given of the effect of direct contact with fugitives and of arrests under the Fugitive Slave Act in arousing anti-slavery sentiment in the North. Descriptions are given of the skilful ways in which Negroes in the North organized to prevent arrests or to rescue Negroes already seized by the officials. Special vigilance committees, both Negro and white, were formed after the passage of the infamous Fugitive Slave Act of 1850. Methods of rapid communication were worked out for sending warnings to communities on which raids by Federal deputy marshals were expected.

Such was the resistance to the Act of 1850 that only "At rare intervals in these cases," according to Aptheker, "the slaveholders, backed by the might of the Federal government, won, and the slaves were re-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

turned. But these were Pyrrhic victories, because the commotion and excitement attending the return of every slave meant that the question of slavery had been brought before the minds of tens of thousands of people."

In dealing with the organized Abolitionist societies, Aptheker correctly emphasizes that of all the Abolitionists, the Negroes were the most consistent.

Evidence is given of organized Abolitionist activity on the part of Negroes, dating from 1760, when slaves in New England challenged the legal concept of slavery through bringing an action of trespass against their masters. From that time on, there are records of petitions submitted by Negroes to provincial and state governing bodies; one such petition was submitted in 1775 to a Committee of Correspondence and was followed by a convention of many citizens which pledged to work consistently for abolition. Throughout the remainder of the eighteenth century, records are extant of petitions by Negroes, of contributions to the extensive anti-slavery literature of the time, and of the emergence of Negro organizations for emancipation. Articles by Negroes appeared in the *American Museum,* published in Philadelphia in 1788. And in 1787 Philadelphia Negroes formed the Free African Society. Similar societies later appeared in Newport, R. I., in New York City and in Boston.

It might have been well for Aptheker to have examined more fully what connection existed between these Negro societies and the general emancipationist movement founded in Philadelphia in 1775 under the presidency of Benjamin Franklin.

Aptheker continues to record the work of Negro Abolitionists in the early eighteenth century — again without indicating their relation to the national federation of anti-slavery groups which, during this period, had organizations in both North and South and held national conventions regularly until the late 1820's.

Negroes paved the way for the emergence of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1833, many Negroes who had been active for years in earlier movements becoming national and local leaders of that organization from the beginning. By 1831, fifty Negro Abolitionist organizations existed, ready to join the broader movement as it arose. These societies had for years maintained a determined opposition to the American Colonization Society.*

An account is given of the emergence of a Negro anti-slavery press, dating from the appearance in 1827, in New York City, of *Freedom's Journal,* a weekly, with agents throughout the North and South, as well as in Haiti, Canada and England. The Boston agent of this paper, David Walker, in 1829 published his famous Appeal, which, by organized effort, was circulated in the South. In that same year, two other pamphlets were published by Negroes, *The Ethiopian Manifesto* by Robert Alexander Young of New

* This society was founded by slaveholders and had as its fundamental purpose the colonizing of free Negroes whose presence within the South consistently disturbed the equanimity of the bourbons.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

York and *The Hope of Liberty*, consisting of poems by a North Carolina slave, George Moses Horton, and printed in Raleigh, North Carolina.

In discussing the period from the formation of the American Anti-Slavery Society until the Civil War, Aptheker indicates that, side by side with the societies embracing both Negro and white, there existed many all-Negro societies, such as the Massachusetts General Colored Association. It was these Negro societies which undertook the most dangerous work, such as penetration of the South itself for raids and rescues. Among these were secret societies, such as the Order of the Twelve of the Knights and Daughters of Labor in Cincinnati and the Knights of Liberty in St. Louis, which aided the flight of hundreds of slaves.

The pamphlet takes note of the first national Negro convention, held in Philadelphia in 1830, which formed the American Society for Free Persons of Color.

Annual national, as well as state, conventions were held by Negroes from 1830 on. Invariably these staunchly denounced colonization schemes. All manifestations of Jim Crowism, disfranchisement and chauvinism in the North were denounced in conjunction with the primary struggle against slavery. Such meetings pledged their support to Garrison's *Liberator*, and the general Abolitionist movement.

While stressing the independent activity of Negroes, Aptheker also emphasizes the extensive and outstanding work of Negroes in the joint activity of the American Anti-Slavery Society. In its early years, the overwhelming majority of the subscribers and supporters of Garrison's *Liberator* were Negro, only one-fourth of the subscribers being white in 1834. Many contributions by Negroes appeared in the *Liberator* and other Abolitionist papers.

The organizational activity of Negroes in the Anti-Slavery Society is emphasized. The Declaration of the Convention which founded the Society in Philadelphia in 1833 was written by Garrison, John Greenleaf Whittier and Samuel J. May in the home of a Negro, Frederick A. Hinton, and was signed by three Negroes. Four of the original members of the Board of Managers of the Anti-Slavery Society were Negro, while there were five Negro members of the Board of the later American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. Key figures in the local vigilance committees were frequently Negroes, and Frederick Douglass, in 1847, became President of the New England Anti-Slavery Society. This work of Negro abolitionists was found both in the leadership and among the rank and file.

In the work of agitation, the most effective of all speakers, as recognized by the Abolitionist leaders, were Negroes—especially fugitive slaves. Scores of these toured the country and also Europe. The greatest orator of them all, as well as undoubtedly the greatest Abolitinonist in general, was the heroic Frederick Douglass.

* * *

Aptheker has assembled in his pamphlet data on the role of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Negro Abolitionists which should be studied widely by both Negro and white for a deeper knowledge of the glorious revolutionary and democratic traditions of the Negro people.

One serious shortcoming, however, should be pointed out in this as in previous contributions by Aptheker. This is the absence of a sufficient *interpretation* of the data which he has so ably assembled. In seeking to emphasize the great role of the Negro people in America, Aptheker has failed to analyze sufficiently *the relation of the struggles of the Negro people to the general movements and events in American history.* Thus, the accounts he gives of Negro achievements seem too isolated from the main stream of American history, which thereby tends to defeat in part the aim he has enunciated, to show the real effectiveness of Negro struggles. This absence of sufficient analysis also prevents him at times from selecting data in the most effective manner.

Especially important for the theme of the present work is his failure to analyze the bitter conflicts within the American Anti-Slavery Society which led to an inevitable and necessary split in 1840. Garrisonian abolitionism was outstanding in its earlier years in arousing the nation to the evils of slavery, in exposing the system, and launching the movement against it. But it always bore within it the seeds of sectarianism, "Leftism," and Utopianism in its bitter opposition to political action, its refusal to cooperate with any but simon-pure Abolitionists, its demand for all followers to adhere to many reforms other than abolition, its pacifism, its advocacy of secession, and its merciless opposition to the Union and the Constitution. Garrisonianism became an obstruction upon the anti-savery movement as it began to assume mass proportions; and it was primarily the Abolitionists of the old Northwest under the leadership of men like James G. Birney, who played the really progressive role. In breaking with Garrisonian sectarianism they took those practical steps, leading toward political action, which first, through the Liberty Party, later the Free Soil Party, and finally through blocs with Free Democrats and Anti-Slavery Whigs, found a way to the establishment of that common front with the broad masses of America which bore such rich fruit in the form of the Republican Party, the revolutionary party that really destroyed slavery and won citizenship for the Negro people in the fierce days of 1860-76. No analysis is developed in Aptheker's pamphlet of the character of this split within the ranks of Abolitionism, so decisive for the real Emancipation. Some knowledge of that inner conflict is absolutely essential for a thorough understanding of the role played by the Negro people in the Abolitionist movement. It would be of the highest importance to know the role that Negroes played in breaking from the sectarianism of Garrisonianism and in launching upon political action. To what extent did they assist and join forces with Birney and later the Free Soilers? To the extent that Negro Abolitionists stood apart

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from this conflict and remained with Garrison, why was this the case? These are questions to which we need answers.

Aptheker has given us sufficient material to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that Negroes were involved actively and on an extensive scale in the Abolitionist movement. He has shown us that they were organizers, editors, journalists, orators. But it is not enough for a Marxist to show us that Negroes were *in* these struggles. It is important to know *where they stood* —and *why*—in relation to the ideological and political currents so decisive in the actual mobilization of the American people in the direction of carrying through the second American Revolution. A work from Aptheker in solving the problem posed here, namely, on the role of the Negro in the building of an anti-slavery party, analyzing the role of the Negro at the time of the split in the American Anti-Slavery Society, in the Liberty and Free Soil Parties, and finally in the emergence of the Republican Party from the time of the statewide People's conventions in the Northwest in 1854 until the crystallization of the Radical Republican group during the Civil War, would be a contribution of outstanding importance, which would bridge the gap between the present work and his notable pamphlet on *The Negro in the Civil War.*

FRANCIS FRANKLIN

EASTERN WORKINGMEN AND NATIONAL LAND POLICY, 1829-1862, by Helen S. Zahler. Columbia University Press, 246 pp. 1941. $2.25.

THE first volume of *Capital* ends with these words: ". . . the capitalist method of production and accumulation, in short, capitalist private property, demands as its fundamental condition the annihilation of self-earned property, in other words, the expropriation of the worker."

Marx penned these words in connection with a consideration of the labor-supply problem facing a bourgeoisie established in undeveloped and vast areas, such as Australia or pre-Civil War America. The existence of this virgin, unappropriated territory, relatively easy of access for the poor of the settled districts, made *possible,* in the words of Marx, the "continuous transformation of wage workers into independent producers who work for themselves instead of working for capital, and enrich themselves instead of enriching his worship the capitalist." This possibility "has an injurious reaction upon the state of the labor market. Not only does the rate of the exploitation of the wage worker remain indecently low. In addition, the wage worker, since he is no longer in a relation of dependence, ceases to have any feeling of de-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pendence as regards the abstemious capitalist." (*Capital,* International Publishers, p. 853.)

The greatest natural resource of nineteenth-century America was its tremendous expanse of unoccupied public land. And the issue of the methods of disposal of this treasure, calling into conflict, as it did, the rulers of the North against those of the South, and the masses of people versus the propertied interests —land speculators, slaveholders, railroad titans, robber barons—was a basic force in American history.

Dr. Zahler's work offers some interesting data on the sectional conflict, but it is particularly concerned with the efforts of the workers to bring about the distribution of the public land on the freest and widest possible basis, thus providing them with an effective weapon to withstand the bosses' attempts to drive down their wages, and, in this way, as well as by cutting down unemployment, giving added strength to attempts at unionization.

This is an important contribution to American historiography; for, hitherto, the idea has been fostered that the movement culminating in the liberalization of the land laws came—to quote a recent textbook on the subject (I. F. Woestemeyer and J. M. Gambrill, *The Westward Movement,* N. Y., 1939, p. 46)—"in response to constant agitation from the frontier, and from farmers all over the nation" with not a word being mentioned concerning the independent and persistent demand for agrarian reforms coming from the mechanics, artisans, and factory workers.

Marx and Engels, however, as contemporary obervers, referred to the "Agrarian Reformers in America" as a working class party (*The Communist Manifesto,* International Publishers, p. 43) and, indeed, put forward, as the first of the transitional measures toward the new society which they envisaged, the "Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes." (*Ibid.,* p. 30; see also Marx to Sorge, London, June 30, 1881, in *The Correspondence of Marx and Engels,* International Publishers, pp. 394-95.) This is a precise formulation of the most advanced demands of the American working class *prior to the Civil War.*

Dr. Zahler demonstrates that an important fighting and *organizing* demand of that class was for the securing of the people's ownership of the state lands, and a policy of disposal of that land which would have made it available free of charge to all landless citizens. This demand accompanied other announced workers' objectives, such as the right to organize, a shorter working day, and free universal education. It played a significant part in American political history, and was one of the leading factors in calling into being the progresive Republican Party.* Indeed, as the

* In noting the connection between the Agrarian Reformers and the foundation of the Republican Party—the party, too, of the rising industrial bourgeoisie—is to be observed Marx's comment in his polemic against Proudhon (1847) that many early radical followers of Ricardo, as Cherbuliez, Hilditch, and the elder Mill, "demanded that rent should be paid to the state in order that it may serve as a substitute for taxes. This is a frank expression of the hatred which the *industrial capitalist* dedicates to the landed proprietor, who seems to him a useless and superfluous element in the general total of bourgeois production," Dr. Zahler misses this point.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

author points out, it was a prominent National Reformer, Alvan E. Bovay, who pioneered in organizing and who actually named that party.

This work represents a contribution to the history of the American working class in that it makes readily available, more fully than any other single book, the mass of evidence demonstrating the active participation of that class in the efforts—partially successful—to obtain a land policy favorable to the needs and aspirations of the common people.

HERBERT BIEL.

LABOR FACT BOOK 5, prepared by Labor Research Association, New York, 1941, 224 pp., $1.

THE new *Labor Fact Book 5* offers valuable background facts at this time when the people of the United States are joining hands with the people of the Soviet Union, Great Britain and China in a decisive struggle for the destruction of fascism. The participation of American labor in all phases of defense and in the extension of full aid to the anti-fascist struggle needs to be guided now more than ever by knowledge of recent events and by the experiences of labor in the United States and abroad. With its usual high standard of objectivity, accuracy and inclusive treatment of vital facts of concern to labor, this fifth issue of *Labor Fact Book*, prepared by Labor Research Association, reports the events of the last quarter of 1938 and the epochal years of 1939 and 1940. Once again it furnishes a lucid record of the political and social movements of the period and a sharply focussed mirror of recent developments.

Labor's efforts to limit prices, prevent defense profiteering, extend wages and social services and preserve trade unions and civil rights will be amply fortified by the wide range of relevant topics covered compactly in the short space of 224 pages in *Labor Fact Book 5*. Approximately one-fourth of the book is devoted to the effect of the war situation on American economy, and particularly on labor at home and in other countries. The curtailment of government spending for welfare services to the people is effectively traced in a section entitled "From Depression to War Boom." The sharp increase in the production of capital goods is contrasted with a lowered rate of increase in the production of consumers' commodities. The corresponding relatively slight increase in the consuming power of the people is shown to be the result of the slow advance in employment and payrolls in this period. A vigorous answer to those who are trying to defeat the campaign of the trade unions for wage increases is afforded in the figures on the huge profits

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reported by corporations derived from reports of the National City Bank and the Standard Statistics Company.

Material pertinent to the struggle against the rising cost of living is contained in the discussion of budgets for decent living, of prices in wartime, of the wages of labor, including the discriminatory wage levels of Negro and woman labor, and the important problems of health and unemployment. These are given in the setting of the National Resources Committee report on consumers' incomes in the United States, a summary of which reveals the gross disparity of the distribution of income in the class structure of American society.

The discussion of the manner in which the war has affected labor in European countries and in Canada warrants careful reading. The facts about suppression of liberties in Canada and the effort to destroy the freedom of the trade union movement there, as detailed in the *Labor Fact Book*, present an important challenge to American labor in the common struggle of the peoples of Canada and the United States against the fascist menace. The value of the book would have been enhanced if similar material were presented on the labor movement in Latin America. There is also a regrettable absence of material on labor conditions in China and the Soviet Union.

The comprehensive treatment of the gains and retrogressions in legislation revealed in a long chapter on legislation reaffirms the imperative need to safeguard and extend the National Labor Relations Act, to assure the enforcement of the Wage-Hour Law, and to reinvigorate the struggle for national health insurance and a broad housing program. The highly competent review of the situation confronting farmers and agricultural labor provides the key to a better understanding of the farmers' plight in the face of rising living costs and the need for stronger farmer-labor unity.

An excellent chapter surveying the developments in the A. F. of L., C.I.O. and railroad labor summarizes the convention decisions on the significant issues before the labor movement. Statistics on union membership and the continuation of the earlier *Labor Fact Book* listings of strikes are valuable.

The ample evidence given by the *Labor Fact Book* on the drive of the reactionary forces in America to crush labor's rights and deprive the people of their civil liberties should stimulate increased vigilance and activity on the part of unions and progressive organizations to protect our democratic rights. The balance sheet, according to the *Labor Fact Book*, indicates clearly that certain real gains in the maintenance of civil rights have been offset by serious and far-reaching losses. Defense preparations have offered pretexts for Red-baiting, for attacks on religious and political minorities, for the persecution of unions under the anti-trust laws and for the arrest and imprisonment of leaders and active workers of trade unions and progressive organizations. Especially striking is the review of the union-smashing activities of governmental agencies such as the Federal Bureau of In-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vestigation and the Dies Committee. There is irrefutable proof that the offensive of the reactionary interests of America in the last year and a half imperils all progressive forces, in the documentation given on the anti-labor tactics of employers' associations, on the murders of active trade unionists, on the growth of anti-Semitism and of vigilantism and terror against the Negro people, and on the imprisonment of anti-fascist leaders like Earl Browder, Oscar Wheeler and the Oklahoma Communists.

The *Labor Fact Book* is more than a reference book, it is a vital document of the role of workers and farmers in the dynamics of present-day capitalism. Together with the correct working class political theory, it provides a sound basis for action to check fascism.

C. T.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LATEST BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

Communism and Culture, by Earl Browder, Workers Library Publishers, N. Y., 5c.

Communism Versus Fascism, by William Z. Foster, Workers Library Publishers, 5c.

The Fight Against Hitlerism, by William Z. Foster and Robert Minor, Workers Library Publishers, 5c.

Wages and Profits in Wartime, by Labor Research Association, International Publishers, N. Y., 5c.

America Needs Earl Browder, by A. B. Magil, Workers Library Publishers, 1c.

The Negro People and the New World Situation, by James W. Ford, Workers Library Publishers, 1c.

Soviet Russia Versus Nazi Germany, by Corliss Lamont, American Council on Soviet Relations, N. Y., 5c.

The Road To Victory, by Earl Browder, Workers Library Publishers, 5c.

La Libertad de Browder Es la Nuestra, by Juan Marinello, Comite Pro-Libertad de Presos Politicos de America, La Habana, Cuba.

The American Review on the Soviet Union, Vol. IV, No. 3, August, 1941, American Russian Institute, N.Y., 25c.

Arrows for the Enemy, by Maurice Chanis, Brief Books, Chicago, Illinois, 50c.

Pacific-Philippine Affairs, No. 1, July, 1941, Kalayaan Publications, Manila, Philippine Islands, 10 centavos.

The Red Army, Workers Library Publishers. Illustrated, 10c.

The Don Flows Home to the Sea, by Mikhail Sholoknov, Alfred Knopf, N. Y., $3.50.

The Soviet Power, by Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, Abridged "Million Edition," International Publishers, 5c.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"With this book we will raise up a whole generation schooled in the best thought produced by humanity."—EARL BROWDER.

HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

Written with the personal participation of Joseph Stalin, this volume is the most fundamental study of the history of the Bolshevik Party and the Russian Revolutions of 1905 and of February and October, 1917. • It elaborates and develops the essential principles of Marxism-Leninism in terms of the practical and theoretical problems which confronted the workers and toilers of Russia at every stage of the struggle for liberation from capitalist exploitation and for Soviet power. • The volume includes a section, written entirely by Stalin, on dialectical and historical materialism. It also contains a profound analysis of international relationships and forces which provides invaluable material for a better understanding of the historical background of the present world war.

354 pages. Price $.75

Order from:

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Selected List of New Pamphlets

THE RED ARMY . . . . . **$.10**

Profusely illustrated, the study of the origins, history, role and organization of the Red Army will aid the reader to a better understanding of the epochal events which are taking place today.

THE ROAD TO VICTORY, by Earl Browder . . . **.05**

A compilation of the writings of the General Secretary of the Communist Party on the struggle against Hitler fascism and the Munich policy of "appeasement."

DEFEND AMERICA BY SMASHING HITLERISM, by William Z. Foster . . . . . **.01**

An up-to-the-minute analysis of the international situation and the tasks in the struggle to defeat Hitler and Hitlerism.

WAGES AND PROFITS IN WARTIME, Prepared by Labor Research Association . . . . **.05**

A timely study of wages, profits, the cost of living, and labor conditions in the United States today, under the impact of the present war situation.

AMERICA NEEDS EARL BROWDER, by A. B. Magil . **.01**

This pamphlet vividly reveals Earl Browder's courageous and far-sighted leadership in the struggle against Hitler fascism.

THE NEGRO PEOPLE AND THE NEW WORLD SITUATION, by James W. Ford . . . . . **.01**

The Negro's stake in the fight against Hitlerism, and the tasks in light of the changed world situation, outlined by an outstanding Negro leader of the American working class.

•

Order from:

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 142, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED